

den, Craig, Aspen, Breckenridge, Basalt, New Castle, Silt, Eagle, Redcliff, Minturn, Fruita, Carbondale, Grand Valley, Clifton, De Beque, Rifle, and Olathe, in the fourth congressional district of Colorado, in support of the measure to tax interstate mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Forsythe Dyeing Co., of New Haven, Conn., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph A. Parker & Sons Co., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Coral Manufacturing Co., of Norristown, Pa., favoring tariff on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 20, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy favor and grace and guidance for the duties of this new day. Our duties are ever increasing; our responsibilities are more and more with every coming day. By Thy grace we have erected a great empire and by Thy grace alone shall we be enabled to project the policies which carry out the plans and secure the permanency of our Nation's life, and the development of all its resources. Grant us Thy guidance and blessing as Thou hast given Thy guidance and blessing to the fathers. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REFUNDS OF DRAWBACKS (S. DOC. NO. 248).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be read.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 18, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

Sir: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the Senate resolution, dated the 10th instant, directing me to submit to the Senate a statement showing certain data relative to applications for, and payment of, drawbacks under paragraph O, Section IV, of the present tariff act, for various periods.

In reply I have to state that instructions have been given to various collectors of customs to forward the required data to the department, where it will be compiled and submitted to the Senate with the least possible delay. I may add that the clerical labor involved, requiring as it does reference to every drawback transaction in the Customs Service for a period of two and a half years, will consume considerable time, but that the same will be expedited in every possible way.

Respectfully,

W. G. McAdoo, Secretary.

WATER-POWER SITES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 17, 1916.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Sir: In accordance with the provisions of Senate resolution No. 544, passed by the Sixty-third Congress, third session, I have the honor to transmit herewith the information in my possession as to the ownership and control of the water-power sites in the United States; showing what proportion of such water-power sites is in private ownership and by what companies and corporations such sites in private ownership are owned and controlled; what horsepower has been developed and what proportion of it is owned and controlled by such private companies and corporations; and facts bearing upon the question as to the existence of a monopoly in the ownership and control of hydroelectric power in the United States.

Respectfully,

D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not know what to do with the accompanying papers.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the matter be printed as a public document. It contains valuable information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Here it is [indicating].

Mr. MYERS. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing, then.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me that as the question is being dealt with by the Committee on Commerce it ought to go to that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question of constitutionality is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and also by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. The subject matter, however, is before the Committee on Public Lands. I think the communication and accom-

panying papers ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, they will go to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 153. An act to create a Bureau of Labor Safety in the Department of Labor;

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the Public Utilities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS. I present a letter in the nature of a petition from Hon. A. M. Alderson, secretary of state of Montana, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD with his signature.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA, SECRETARY OF STATE,
Helena, January 14, 1916.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In 1907 reconnaissance and preliminary surveys were begun upon the Flathead irrigation project in northwestern Montana.

In 1908 a construction upon the project was authorized and the first appropriation made by act of Congress. In 1909 actual construction was begun.

In spite of the fact that since the beginning of actual work in 1909 more than six years have elapsed, the project is now only 22.2 per cent completed.

The Flathead project is the largest and most comprehensive Indian irrigation scheme ever undertaken in the United States. The area of the completed project is about 152,000 acres. There is not the slightest question but what all of these lands would easily pay the water-construction charge of \$45 an acre, or even more, if necessary.

There has been a large amount of settling upon these lands, but the people have found, to their sorrow, that they are unable to make a living without irrigation. They have been led to believe, and were entitled to believe, that the Government of the United States would complete this project.

It never can be completed within the lifetime of a settler now upon the project with such insignificant appropriations as have been made in recent years. A large amount of the work already accomplished will go to pieces and its value will be lost unless the work is pushed to final accomplishment.

The State of Montana is firmly of the opinion that an appropriation of \$1,000,000 should be made for the Flathead project this year of 1916, and we ardently hope that the Congress of the United States will recognize the necessity for such an appropriation.

I have the honor to remain,

Sincerely, yours,

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS. I present the petition of pupils of the Reservoir Valley School, in Montana, praying for an appropriation for the Flathead reclamation project in that State. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD with the name of the first signer and underneath the words "and many others" and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVOIR VALLEY SCHOOLHOUSE.

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The undersigned, pupils of the Reservoir Valley Schoolhouse, do most urgently and respectfully petition of Congress that an appropriation of not less than \$1,000,000 be passed by this session of Congress for work on the Flathead irrigation project for the ensuing year. This schoolhouse is located within the Flathead project and our education will depend to a large extent on the manner that this project is prosecuted.

Respectfully,

VENUS CAFFEY,
(And many others).

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions in the nature of a petition, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

Whereas the Grand Canyon of the Colorado has been set aside by the President of the United States as a public monument; and
Whereas every part of this great region should be made accessible and usable in the largest degree to the public, as well as preserved for the good of generations to come; and
Whereas if this public monument were made a national park, the necessary care and attention could and would be given to it by the United States Government for the benefit of the present generation and posterity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Yavapai County Chamber of Commerce, through its board of directors, this 15th day of January, 1916. That they do hereby recommend and earnestly urge that the Grand Canyon of the Colorado be made a national park at the earliest date expedient; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, to Senators HENRY F. ASHURST and MARCUS A. SMITH, and to Representative CARL HAYDEN; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the various commercial organizations of Arizona, together with the request that they cooperate in every way to help secure the proper legislation.

Approved.

C. E. YOUNT, *President*.

Attest:

GRACE M. SPARKES, *Secretary*.

Mr. ASHURST. I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Yavapai County, Ariz. The resolutions relate to a delicate subject, and I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN. I have a telegram from the National Wool Growers' Association, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SALT LAKE, UTAH, January 19, 1916.

Senator F. E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.:

Probably Gov. Gooding, of Idaho, and myself will leave for Washington to-day. If we do not reach there in time, it is imperative that the stock trails provided for in the homestead bills should be at least 1 mile wide. You must remember that in order to reach forest reserves and shipping points sheep will have to be in these trails as long as 15 days, with no feed other than that furnished by the trails. Certainly no man should be allowed to make an additional entry unless it adjoins his original entry. We hope action on the bill can be delayed until we reach Washington, and we hope that the Senate will wait for the recommendations of the committee.

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Monroe, Mich., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the University Club of Harbor Springs, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of S. A. Valentine Camp, No. 21, Department of Michigan, United Spanish War Veterans, of Escanaba, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GRONNA. I have here resolutions adopted by the Devils Lake District Medical Society, of North Dakota, calling attention to the lack of a sufficient number of medical officers in the Regular Army. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVILS LAKE DISTRICT MEDICAL SOCIETY,
Devils Lake, North Dakota.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Devils Lake District Medical Society January 11, 1916, the following resolution was passed and a copy ordered sent to the Secretary of War and our Senators and Congressmen:

"Whereas the President and the honorable Secretary of War have announced in the public press that a scheme for the reorganization of the Army will be presented to Congress at its coming session which will materially increase the military establishment; and

"Whereas we recall the indignant protests and criticisms of the Nation at the failure to provide adequately for the sick and wounded at the beginning of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War; and

"Whereas it is known that this failure was due to the lack of a sufficient number of medical officers in the Regular Army and a means for increasing the medical establishment at the outbreak of war; and

"Whereas in spite of the lessons of the Spanish-American War, which were fresh in mind in the reorganization of the Army in 1901, the medical department was not properly increased, and no provision was made for its expansion in time of emergency; and

"Whereas to correct the defects in the 1901 legislation subsequent legislation was necessary, in which the medical profession of the United States was called on to assist: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Devils Lake Medical Society of North Dakota. That the Secretary of War be petitioned to make adequate provision in the reorganization of the Army about to be presented to Congress for a sufficient number of medical officers for the regular establishment, which provision should aggregate a proportion of medical officers of at least seventy-five hundredths of 1 per cent of the enlisted strength of the Army, or such number as the Surgeon General of the Army may deem necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be petitioned to make provision in this reorganization for the expansion of the medical department at the beginning of war by calling into service in the Medical Reserve Corps physicians from civil life who have been instructed in their special duties as medical officers in our summer camps and otherwise, as the War Department may see fit."

G. F. DREW,

Secretary Devils Lake Medical Society.

Mr. HARDING presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against an additional tax on intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the pure-food law to make misdemeanors false and fraudulent statements regarding curative qualities of medicines, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Norwalk, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwalk, and of sundry citizens of North Olmsted, all in the State of Ohio, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Sandusky Council, Knights of Columbus, of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to set aside October 12 as Columbus Day, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry inmates of the Soldiers' Home of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a fixed price for trade-marked and patented articles, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Memorial Baptist Church, of Albany, N. Y., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of B. F. Gladding & Co., of South Otsele, N. Y., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 413, Loyal Order of Moose, of Quincy, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to grant the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Methodist Preachers' Association, of Springfield, Mass., remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the American Writing Paper Co., of Holyoke, Mass., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of the congregation of the Whitney Avenue Memorial Christian Church, of Washington, D. C., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I have just received. It is short.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

DOUGLAS, WYO., January 20, 1916.

Senator CLARK, Washington, D. C.:

Please withhold action on homestead and leasing bill just passed by House until you can hear from a delegation appointed by the National Wool Growers and a delegation to be appointed by the American National Live Stock Association at El Paso 25th to 27th this month, if possible to do so. Please answer.

J. M. WILSON.

OIL LANDS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram bearing upon the proposed legislation affecting the oil industry in California. I ask to have it read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., January 19, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please have following petition read in Senate immediately:

"To the President and Congress of the United States:

"A multitude of citizens of the United States, some thousands in number, who are the threatened victims of legislation concerning oil lands now pending in the National Congress, hereby beg leave to enter protest against any precipitate and hurried legislation upon the subject referred to. The bills as now pending bear every evidence of superficiality in their sweeping emasculation of long-established statutory laws which have been the basis of a rational and uniform development of the national domain for over a half century. They absolutely wreck a most important division of the national land system and leave in confusion the legal status of vested rights acquired by a large element of worthy and industrious citizens who are seeking to acquire property under laws sanctified by long usage. The bills referred to bear strong evidence of having been inspired by those who have been the recipients of munificent donations from the General Government and whose holdings are now the subject of judicial inquiry. The proposed enactments are not only confiscatory but are punctuated with ambiguities which will require an untold amount of litigation to determine their legal significance. If such legislation is enacted it will paralyze every effort of the man of modest means who has withstood the privations and severities of a desert country in seeking mineral wealth, believing that the legislatures and courts of both State and Nation would insure to him the full protection of rights acquired by him under the established mineral laws of the United States, which have been in full force and operation for many decades. Any law which imperils or destroys property rights thus acquired can only result in intensifying and expanding the growing popular idea that it is the purpose of the Government to preserve the public domain for the exclusive benefit of the rich and powerful and add to the difficulties of the poor who are seeking to acquire property rights by a strict conformity to the laws of the land. The bills which are pending before the House and Senate should each be entitled 'A law for the establishment of a monopoly of all fuel and power for the benefit of those who have already been enriched by donations from the public domain.' No possible statute could more effectually create and perpetuate such a monopoly, as no private individual or association of persons outside of the great interests themselves could acquire any portion of the public domain by lease with any possible hope of producing an article of commerce therefrom with the handicap of Government supervision and taxation and market such article in competition with those who have already received vast donations of public mineral lands and are exempt forever from any burdens of public surveillance and onerous royalties. The vast majority of legislators have received no information emanating from the private operator in the field except that which has been manipulated and mutilated by influences in close touch with those who frame the laws and give them color and effect. The small operator and prospector have been totally ignored, and their plea for consideration has been smothered by the adroitness of preponderating wealth and sinister politics. Already the atmosphere is becoming malodorous with sensational charges of a political and financial nature which promise to culminate in scandals unequalled in national legislation. Your petitioners enter an earnest plea that all legislation of this character may be delayed until proper consideration can be given to same unmixed with and unsmothered by the tumultuous clamor over international affairs. It is no time for revolutionary legislation touching purely domestic questions, whose consideration is overshadowed by world affairs which now completely absorb the popular mind, and it is the almost universal opinion of those best advised that this particular hour and condition has been selected to perpetrate this ill-advised and outrageous legislative felony. The President and Congress will at an early date receive expression from the thousands whose little all is at stake through the medium of mass meetings held for this purpose for the reasons above stated. A rational delay on such drastic legislation is hereby implored."

JNO. J. MORRIS,
WM. T. FORSYTH,
D. F. WILSON,

Committee Representing over 300 Bona Fide Oil Land Locators.

FREIGHT CONGESTION AT OCEAN DOCKS.

Mr. WORKS. I also send up a letter from the Chamber of Commerce, of Santa Cruz, Cal., on the subject of the congestion of freight at ocean docks, and ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Chamber of Commerce of Santa Cruz urgently calls the attention of Congress to the congestion of freight at ocean docks which is seriously threatening the prosperity of the Nation in general and of the Northwest in particular.

Millions of tons of freight, the products of our farms and factories, are piling up in freight cars, in storage, and on the wharves at water terminals, unable to find bottoms for transportation to the markets of the world. Far from offering relief, the situation assumes a graver aspect every day and must inevitably cause reaction, which may cause a material depression in the price of farm products and stagnation in the work of our factories.

Our farmers and merchants are losing, perhaps forever, the new opportunities and the new markets now open before them, because of a state of paralysis in international means of transportation and the greed of foreign shipowners over which our Government has no jurisdiction: It is therefore

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to speedily adopt emergency measures to adequately meet this situation and to place at the disposal of the President full power to employ all the executive agencies of the Government for the purpose of reopening the congested arteries of trade.

S. A. PALMER, President.

A. S. T. JOHNSON, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 710) to authorize national banking associations to avail themselves of State laws providing for the guaranteeing of deposits, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 61) thereon.

Mr. STONE. By direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3264) to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the Norwegian Government for the detention of three subjects of Norway in Hudson County, N. J., and I submit a report (No. 60) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. CATRON. From the Committee on Claims, I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1878) making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims, reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section No. 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, and I submit a report (No. 59) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BROWNS FERRY BRIDGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4716) to authorize Dunklin County, Mo., and Clay County, Ark., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River, and I submit a report (No. 58) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ST. FRANCIS RIVER BRIDGE, MISSOURI.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize Butler and Dunklin Counties, Mo., to construct a bridge across St. Francis River, and I submit a report (No. 57) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 3721) for the relief of the estate of Thomas F. Swafford, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3722) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3723) providing for the holding of terms of the district court for the southern division of the western district of the State of Washington at Aberdeen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3724) authorizing the setting aside of certain lands for highway purposes through the public domain, forests, and other reserves of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3725) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Patterson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 3726) for the relief of J. A. Denny;

A bill (S. 3727) for the relief of William Lewis Bryan;

A bill (S. 3728) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah D. Guthrie;

A bill (S. 3729) for the relief of Ben Pigott;

A bill (S. 3730) for the relief of George Jenkins;

A bill (S. 3731) for the relief of John G. Young;

A bill (S. 3732) to refund the cotton tax to the States wherein collected;

A bill (S. 3733) for the relief of Sarah R. Hay;

A bill (S. 3734) for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt, widow of Eli A. Moffitt; and

A bill (S. 3735) for the relief of Cleveland L. Short; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3737) providing for an investigation into the extent and conditions of the practice of experimentation on living animals; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 3738) granting an increase of pension to Julia C. Bradley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 3739) granting a pension to James Gallagher;

A bill (S. 3740) granting a pension to Anna C. Gregory;

A bill (S. 3741) granting a pension to Lucy S. Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 3742) granting a pension to Mary C. Christensen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BECKHAM:

A bill (S. 3743) to reimburse John Simpson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3744) granting an increase of pension to Emma Luman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3745) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eliza Swise (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3746) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. McDonald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3747) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Gray (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Colburn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3749) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fist (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3750) granting an increase of pension to John Clinger (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3751) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Hughes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3752) granting an increase of pension to George H. Stillman;

A bill (S. 3753) granting an increase of pension to Herman F. W. Fisher;

A bill (S. 3754) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Sausaman;

A bill (S. 3755) granting an increase of pension to William A. Dodge;

A bill (S. 3756) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Riddle; and

A bill (S. 3757) granting an increase of pension to James S. Anderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 3758) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Shoemaker, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 3759) for the relief of Wellington F. Larabee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 3760) granting an increase of pension to Berry H. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 84) authorizing the appointment of a board to ascertain and report to Congress the probable cost of acquiring lands on each side of Pennsylvania Avenue as sites for buildings necessary for the transaction of present and

prospective governmental business; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PORTSMOUTH (N. H.) DRY DOCK.

Mr. GALLINGER. I introduce a bill which is a duplicate of one I introduced at the last session, and I ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 3736) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy Yard was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JOHN G. YOUNG.

On motion of Mr. OVERMAN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of John G. Young (S. 3237, 63d Cong.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PUGET SOUND CANAL, WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause preliminary examination and survey to be made and a report to be made thereon to Congress of the intervening territory between Puget Sound and the Columbia River, with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a canal connecting Puget Sound with Grays Harbor, Willapa Harbor, and the Columbia River.

STRATEGIC VALUE OF INLAND WATERWAYS (S. DOC. NO. 249).

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have here an address delivered by the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] at the eighth annual convention of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, held at Savannah, Ga., the 9th of November last, on the subject of the strategic value of inland waterways. It is a most exhaustive and illuminating discussion of the necessity of the improvement and enlargement of our coastwise waterways. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXPORTATION OF LOGWOOD FROM JAMAICA.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a letter from Hon. Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, in reference to the question of the embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica. As this is a matter which concerns very deeply the textile industries of the country, as well as certain other industries, I ask that it be printed in the Record without reading.

Mr. STONE. The letter just presented by the Senator from New Hampshire concerns logwood imported from what country?

Mr. GALLINGER. It relates directly to the embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica, but it touches other countries.

Mr. STONE. Would it not be well to have the letter, after it is printed, referred to the Committee on Finance?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it ought to be done, and I ask that that course be taken.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 15, 1916.

The Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate.

SIR: With reference to previous correspondence with this department in regard to the British embargo on the exportation of logwood from Jamaica, I have the honor to inform you that the department is in receipt of the following cablegram from the American ambassador at London, dated January 13, 1916:

"Foreign office now informs me that as urgent requirements of Great Britain have been met, governor of Jamaica has issued general license permitting export of logwood chips and logwood extract to all British, United States, French, and Italian ports, and that instructions are being sent to governor of British Honduras to issue similar license. It is added that in informing me of measures taken by British Government to facilitate relaxation of embargo in favor of manufacturers in United States it is desired to explain that relaxation must necessarily be conditional on British Government being satisfied that supply of dyewood extract from United States to Canada will be resumed on reasonable scale, and states that they have no doubt but that I will be in a position to give this assurance in view of efforts which have been made by British authorities to meet convenience of American manufacturers."

"Please instruct me if I can give the assurance that dyewood extract is being sent from United States to Canada."

As the lifting of the embargo on logwood in favor of manufacturers in the United States is made conditional on the British Government being satisfied that the supply of dyewood extract from the United States to Canada will be resumed on a reasonable scale, the question of whether American firms are able to obtain logwood from Jamaica and British Honduras will depend on whether the manufacturers of logwood extract, of whom the department is informed there are only two or three, are willing to resume exportation to Canada on a reasonable scale. The department has as yet received no assurances from manufacturers of logwood extract that they will do this.

Information received from American consular officers stationed along the Caribbean coasts and in the West Indies, in response to instructions from the Department of State, directing them to ascertain what supplies of logwood were available for shipment to the United States, indicate that at the present time the only available supply of logwood outside of Jamaica and British Honduras is apparently in Haiti with the possibility of the development of a supply on a reasonable scale from the districts surrounding Barranquilla, Colombia.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

ROBERT LANSING.

SEIZURES OF COTTON AND FOODSTUFFS BY GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, at an earlier day during the session I had an opportunity to address the Senate with reference to the orders in council of March 1 and March 11, passed by Great Britain. I then called attention to the fact that the order of March 11 was, in effect, a declaration of blockade against all the ports of Germany; that it was a direction to enforce that blockade by seizing neutral vessels before they passed the straits which separated Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; that so far as Norway and Sweden and the Baltic coast were concerned it was ineffective and illegal, on account of the fact that Great Britain could not blockade the ports of Germany on the Baltic against the vessels of Norway and Sweden; and that no blockade can be enforced legally unless it is enforced against all neutrals alike.

I also called attention to the fact that this order directed the seizure of the commerce of neutrals going into and out of neutral ports without regard to the character of the goods, if those goods were of presumed German origin or destination.

The illegality of those orders, their disregard of recognized rules of international law, is so apparent that no real effort has been made in Great Britain to defend them. We now hear that Great Britain is about to recede from those two orders. I am not surprised at that. No British statesman of any prominence now a part of the British Government or who is in Parliament has failed within the past 12 years upon the floor of Parliament to denounce as illegal the very procedure of Great Britain which is being conducted at the present time under the order of council of March 11.

We are told that with the repeal of the orders of March 1 and March 11 by the privy council we are to have a direction for a real, genuine blockade of German ports, and that the effect of that action will be to tighten the blockade, and to still further restrict the trade of neutrals with Germany. Some of our newspaper correspondents are, thoughtlessly I hope, scattering the idea that, with a complete declaration of blockade, some increased right of interference will be given to the British Government.

Mr. President, if a declaration of absolute blockade were made, it would change the present status only to this extent: The present order in council leaves it to the discretion of the prize courts as to how they shall handle goods of neutrals seized when seeking to reach blockaded ports. The complete order of blockade would simply subject the vessels and their cargoes seeking to reach blockaded ports to confiscation. But, Mr. President, no neutral vessels are seeking to enter German ports that are now blockaded. Our real contest with Great Britain is the interference with our trade through neutral ports, and no blockade can extend to neutral ports. Blockade is an act of war; it is a part of the process of war directed toward an enemy's soil. It can not be directed toward the soil of a neutral.

On a former occasion I presented to the Senate decision after decision by the courts of Great Britain sustaining the proposition that I have just laid down. I cited text-writer after text-writer, and English judicial decisions from distinguished English authors and jurists, in support of the proposition that a blockade can not reach a neutral port; that the right of interference at neutral ports is limited to the character of the goods. It can only be based on the contraband character of the goods, which means that their character is such that they will be used in war by the military or naval forces of the enemy of Great Britain.

Goods have been classified as "absolute" and "conditional contraband" to assist in deciding the question of evidence required to justify the seizure; "absolute," of such a warlike nature that, going to a belligerent country, they are presumed to be intended for the army, and therefore can be seized on account of their character; "conditional contraband," goods which might be so used, and which might also equally be used by noncombatants; and in this case no seizure can be made unless the belligerent seizing them establishes the fact that they are really to be used by the military and naval forces of the opposing belligerent, the burden being upon the belligerent seizing the goods to make the proof.

Mr. President, the English rule has been that conditional contraband going to a neutral port could not be seized at all. Let me illustrate by foodstuffs. Ten per cent of the people are probably in arms and 90 per cent noncombatants. There are, there-

fore, nine chances out of ten that the food might be used by the noncombatants. If it is to be so used, it has the right to go to an opposing belligerent through a neutral port untouched.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that, even though an absolute blockade is directed in the broadest sense, our State Department has already committed us, and correctly committed us, squarely to the proposition that such a blockade would give no right to seize innocent goods owned, by neutral citizens, sailing from neutral ports to neutral ports, even though those goods are to be sent to an opposing belligerent—to Germany or to Austria. I will read just a line from the letter of March 30 from our State Department sent to Great Britain:

It is confidently assumed that His Majesty's Government will not deny that it is a rule sanctioned by general practice that, even though a blockade should exist and the doctrine of contraband as to unblockaded territory be rigidly enforced, innocent shipments may be freely transported to and from the United States through neutral countries to belligerent territory without being subject to the penalties of contraband traffic or breach of blockade, much less to detention, requisition, or confiscation.

I quote, Mr. President, three other extracts from this letter, and I shall quote during my remarks a number of extracts from various papers. I will call attention to their substance, and ask leave now from the Senate to embody in the Record the exact language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The quotation I have just read is an assertion of the right of citizens of neutral countries to trade with the enemies of Great Britain through neutral ports in noncontraband goods. This is an assertion of the right without regard to the orders of March 1 and March 11 last, and even though a formal blockade were declared.

Again, the letter states:

And no claim on the part of Great Britain of any justification for interfering with these clear rights of the United States and its citizens as neutrals could be admitted. To admit it would be to assume an attitude of unneutrality toward the present enemies of Great Britain which would be obviously inconsistent with the solemn obligations of this Government in the present circumstances.

Again, the letter states:

But the novel and quite unprecedented feature of that blockade, if we are to assume it to be properly so defined, is that it embraces many neutral ports and coasts—bars access to them.

Again, it states:

It is manifest that such limitations, risks, and liabilities placed upon the ships of a neutral power on the high seas * * * are a distinct invasion of the sovereign rights of the nation whose ships, trade, or commerce is interfered with.

These and other strong expressions are found in this letter protesting as illegal any effort by Great Britain to blockade the neutral ports of northern Europe against the trade of neutral nations in neutral goods.

The course of Great Britain and the threatened course are well understood by British statesmen to be illegal.

Its continuance is so palpable a violation of the rights of neutrals that no self-respecting nation should submit to it.

Some, even in the United States, have replied that the exigencies of war excuse the British Government for disregarding the rights of American citizens.

I wish to submit a few authorities to show that no nation has a right by municipal regulation to set aside rules or international law and thereby interfere with the rights of trade of a neutral nation.

In second Dallas, the Supreme Court of the United States held "the municipal law of a country can not change the law of nations so as to bind the subjects of another nation."

Time and again the Department of State of the United States has declared a municipal decree "whether executive, legislative, or judicial, contravening the law of nations has no extra-territorial force."

Mr. Evarts, when Secretary of State, announced—

If a Government confesses itself unable or unwilling to conform to those international obligations which must exist between established Governments of friendly States, it would thereby confess that it is not entitled to be regarded or recognized as a sovereign or independent power.

When Ecuador undertook to set up by statute rules subversive of the principles of international law, our State Department declared that "Ecuador placed herself outside of the pale of international intercourse."

Sir Henry Maine, in his work upon international law, declares that—

the State which disclaims the authority of international law places herself outside the circle of civilized nations.

In the first chapter of Moore's Digest of International Law many authorities upon this subject will be found.

The rules of international law come to us from the established customs of nations. The sovereignty of a nation extends to the

commerce of her people upon the ocean; and no opposing nation can interfere with the merchandise of a citizen of another nation not at war, except where the customs of nations have conceded the right of seizure. No nation, by a municipal regulation, can set up a rule of its own in defiance of the customs of nations, and seize the goods of a neutral without being guilty of a lawless act.

But let us see for a moment why the regulation of the privy council is passed. Why are not simply orders issued to the naval forces to seize these vessels and stop this commerce? The reason is obvious. If the cases were permitted to go to the British prize courts with only the direction by the Government of Great Britain to its navy, the prize courts would decide the cases under the rules of international law, and the conduct of Great Britain would at once be stopped by releases in her prize courts of all these illegal seizures. But Great Britain, through her privy council, which is a legislative body, sets aside rules of international law and prescribes a new rule for the seizure of goods of neutrals. Her prize courts are bound by their order, and are prevented from following rules of international law.

There is but one remedy for a neutral nation. It is to contest the orders of the British Privy Council, to assert our rights as a nation. Our citizens can have no redress under these orders in British prize courts.

Treating as established the rules of international law sustained by authority and brought to the attention of the Senate on a previous occasion, I wish to ask consideration of the order of August 21 by the British Privy Council declaring cotton absolute contraband and then to point out the violation by Great Britain of the rights of citizens of the United States, both in its treatment of foodstuffs and of cotton.

COTTON CONTRABAND ORDER.

Never but once before has any country sought to interfere with the free shipment of cotton. It has been recognized as a commodity largely entering into the peaceful uses of the people of the world, and therefore has never been classified as contraband but once before.

This was in the case of Russia, during the Japanese war.

The pretext for the declaration was the use of cotton for the manufacture of powder and explosives. Great Britain promptly protested the action of Russia.

Russia yielded, and cotton continued to be shipped by subjects of Great Britain from India and Egypt to Japan.

I wish, first, to answer the defense of this action which has been widely circulated by English agents and pro-English newspapers.

It has been upon two lines:

First. That the United States made cotton contraband during the Civil War.

Second. That cotton is essential to the manufacture of powder and explosives in Germany, and by the suppression of cotton shipments into Germany the war power of Germany and her allies may be destroyed.

UNITED STATES NEVER DECLARED COTTON CONTRABAND.

As to the first of these claims, it is sillily false. The United States never made cotton contraband during the Civil War. This old story is fully exposed by Moore, in his Digest of International Law. A classification of contraband is based upon the unneutral nature of the goods, and authorizes one belligerent to prevent those goods from entering the country of an enemy nation. It is to keep the enemy from obtaining possession of goods which would be used for military purposes.

What would have been the sense of an order classifying cotton as contraband to prevent it from being shipped into the Southern States? Nobody wanted to ship it into the Southern States. It was already there. They had almost a monopoly of its production. The claim was false and stupid.

Yet, Sir Gilbert Parker, the publicity agent for Great Britain, distributed an article defending the order making cotton absolute contraband, written by Hon. Bernard R. Wise, and justifying the order upon the ground that the United States made cotton contraband during the Civil War.

Now let me deal with the second British excuse.

CONSPIRACY TO INJURE COTTON.

After depressing the price of cotton in the fall of 1914, the British spinners organized to depress the price again in 1915. One-third of the exports of American cotton normally go to Germany and Austria and the neutral ports of northern Europe. Germany and Austria alone consume nearly 3,000,000 of bales annually.

If the British spinners and cotton manufacturers could cut off this market for cotton raised in the United States, it would naturally depress the price. If they could cut it off, they would

exclude the products of German mills from competing with the products of English mills throughout the world.

When the great patriotic gathering was held early in the summer of 1915 in London to demand that cotton should be made absolute contraband, that great soldier, Sir Charles McKara, presided at the meeting. His military record, so far as it is known, is limited to the office which he fills. He is president of the English Cotton Spinners' Association.

I can not believe that English statesmen were so poorly informed, or so lacked capacity for observation, that they did not understand the real purpose of the movement.

When Sir William Ramsey advocated in the London Times placing cotton on the absolute contraband list, he asserted that it was essential to the manufacture of explosives and most of the powder used by Germany. A far more distinguished British scientist flatly contradicted him. Mr. W. F. Reid, former president of the Society of Chemical Industry of Great Britain, spoke as follows before that society in London:

The whole thing is a great fraud. Eminent scientists have made erroneous statements on this subject. If people associated with science would speak only on the branches with which they are connected, the advantages would be very great.

COTTON NOT USED TO MAKE POWDER IN GERMANY.

I shall show by abundant evidence that for months before the order making cotton absolute contraband Germany had substituted wood cellulose for lint cotton in the production of powders. The use of cotton for the manufacture of powder has always been confined principally to what is called linters. Linters are the short waste scraped from cotton seed at the oil mill when the seed are being ground. Manufacturers' waste consists of the very short particles of cotton that fly off as the cotton is spun. Linters and manufacturers' waste, when used as a base for powder, are ground to pulp. They then become the base or filler which is treated with explosive acids to make powder.

Linters and manufacturers' waste are of but little ordinary value, and have usually sold at very low prices. They form a cheap and useful base for nitrocellulose powders. The manufacture of powders of this character by the use of cotton linters or waste began in 1854. Long before the war in Germany cellulose had been made from wood pulp, and this wood-pulp cellulose had occasionally been used as a substitute for cotton linters and manufacturers' waste in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders.

Shortly after the war began it was published that Germany was abandoning the use of cotton linters and waste and building numerous plants for the manufacture of wood cellulose as a base or filler for nitrocellulose powders.

I am now prepared to show that for months past Germany has abandoned the use of cotton in the manufacture of powders and is using wood cellulose as the filler for its nitrocellulose powders.

President Lohman, of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce, is one of the foremost business men of Germany. In a speech delivered last month before the Bremen Chamber of Commerce he declared that for more than eight months Germany had used wood pulp as a substitute for cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders.

I have in my hand a letter from Dr. W. Will, director of the Central Bureau of Technico-Scientific Research of the University of Bremen. He declares that the chemists of Germany long before the war began understood the use of wood pulp as a substitute for cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powders, and that for months past the substitute had been used in the German powder mills, and used with perfect success.

I ask that his letter be printed in the Record as an exhibit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. (The letter referred to is printed in the appendix at the end of Mr. SMITH's remarks.)

REPORT OF MR. BIBLE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In the early fall Mr. Howard W. Bible, of North Carolina, whom I have known for a number of years, a most reputable citizen of the United States, returning from Germany, assured me that the lack of linters or cotton was in no way affecting the manufacture of powders in Germany; that wood pulp was used as a substitute. He intended returning to Germany in a few weeks, and, at my request, he agreed to personally investigate the subject while in Germany and to give me his testimony on the result of his investigation.

Mr. Bible is now in Washington. I have in my hand a letter from him, prepared last week. He is ready to testify before any committee of Congress upon this subject. He points out in this letter that, on returning to Germany, in Bremen he presented letters from me to President Lohman and explained my desire, if cotton had ceased to be used in Germany for the manufacture of powder and explosives, to furnish proof of that fact

for a protest I wished to make against the British order declaring cotton contraband.

President Lohman gave him his cordial support and arranged for a conference in Berlin between Mr. Bible and representatives of the various departments, that he might make his formal application to them for definite information and personal knowledge with reference to the use of cotton in the manufacture of gunpowder and explosives.

His letter states that, with President Lohman, he met representatives of the various departments by appointment in Berlin, and after presenting the objects of his investigation, he was assured by them that for months past the German Government had ceased to use cotton, and had with entire success substituted wood pulp in the manufacture of powder and explosives.

He was furnished a list of 60 mills in Germany engaged in the manufacture of wood cellulose, and also a list of munition plants, and authorized to visit such number as he saw fit, that he might have personal knowledge as to the materials therein used for the manufacture of powder.

He selected one plant, and, with Prof. Lohman and an officer of the German Government, he visited the plant; was permitted to go entirely through it, and found that all the raw material being brought in for manufacture into powder was wood cellulose, and that in some portions of the mill there were still rags used. He states that he found some cotton linters in the mill, but they had been laid aside, and were no longer used in the manufacture of powder.

He further states that he saw 3,000 bales of linters at one place which had been released by the munition department of the Government and disposed of to cotton factories.

I ask that Mr. Bible's letter be printed in full as an exhibit. The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have upon my desk packages of wood cellulose sent from Germany to me by Mr. Bible.

I defy anyone to produce proof to sustain the British claim. I was also advised by Mr. Bible that Col. Kuhn, our military attaché at Berlin, had been given the same opportunity to visit munition plants and to acquire the information that he, Mr. Bible, had acquired, and that Col. Kuhn was furnished the opportunity to know that Germany used no cotton in the manufacture of nitrocellulose powder.

I applied to the Secretary of War for Col. Kuhn's report. He could not give it to me. I have his letter here. First I applied orally. He explained to me the difficulty; that it was agreed between all countries that military attachés during a war were only permitted to remain in countries and make reports with the understanding that the neutral receiving them would regard them as absolutely confidential until the war was over, and for that reason he could not give me Col. Kuhn's report.

But the British embassy has admitted it. They did not intend to admit it, but they have admitted it. Yesterday, realizing that the false pretext upon which they justified their order making cotton absolute contraband had been and would be exploded, they issued a statement on the subject. I hold it in my hand. It begins:

The British military authorities have issued the following information with regard to the use of cotton for military purposes.

It goes on then to show how cotton can be used as a base for ballistite, cordite, and nitrocellulose powder. It shows how much is used of each when cotton is used as the base. It then says:

Apart from explosives, cotton forms the base of many fabrics and materials employed for military purposes, such as clothing, sheets—

And so forth.

I think we knew that before. I do not think it was a novel statement that sheets could be made out of cotton or that clothing could be made out of cotton. Then it closes:

The alleged use of substitutes for cotton in the manufacture of explosives does not affect the fact that cotton is a war material in general use.

What does that mean? About this: "We told you last summer that we made your cotton contraband, and we justified the order of March 1 and March 11, because by keeping cotton out of Germany we would end the war. We would put an end to Germany's munition-plant service; we would suppress their powder magazines, and leave her without anything in the shape of explosives to conduct the war. But now you know it is not so, and we say that even if it is not used for explosives, even though substitutes are used instead of cotton in Germany, still it is a war material in general use."

If anywhere among English writers or English statesmen before can be found such a statement, I invite its production. Nearly anything can be used in some way in connection with

war. That does not make it contraband as war material. Cotton can be used to make sheets. But sheets are not limited to soldiers. Cotton can be used to make clothes, and clothes are not limited to soldiers.

The very distinction that is drawn in treating the merchandise of neutrals is that a belligerent can not strike down the trade of a neutral simply because it might be used for military purposes. Every decision of Great Britain, every text writer of Great Britain, and every statesman of Great Britain for the last hundred years dealing with the subject has denounced any claim of right to interfere with neutral trade simply because it might in some way be used by an enemy army or navy. The rule has been laid down without interruption that the belligerent seizing goods must prove that they were intended for the army and navy, and that they were not for the use of noncombatants.

COTTON ALWAYS FREE FROM SEIZURE BY A BELLIGERENT.

Having disposed of the two excuses given by Great Britain for making cotton absolute contraband, let us consider the status which this commodity occupied under the customs of nations with reference to naval warfare.

The great majority of the people of the world are clothed with goods manufactured from cotton. In times of war not over 10 per cent of the population would be engaged in active service. Therefore, 90 per cent of the population of any country engaged in war would require in their peaceful pursuits the use of goods manufactured from cotton.

Recognizing this fact, cotton has uniformly been classed as an article which no nation could make contraband, but which all neutrals could ship freely to belligerent countries.

RUSSIA YIELDS TO BRITISH VIEW.

As before stated, the one exception was in the case of Russia, which, in 1904, during the war with Japan, declared cotton absolute contraband. England protested this action by Russia in the following language:

The quantity of raw cotton that might be used for explosives would be infinitesimal in comparison with the bulk of the cotton exported from India to Japan for peaceful purposes, and to treat harmless cargoes of this latter description as unconditionally contraband would be to subject a branch of innocent commerce to a most unwarrantable interference.

This was Great Britain's view even before wood cellulose had been developed as a substitute for cotton.

Oh, what does this letter from the British embassy look like when we consider this action of Great Britain toward Russia? But not only Great Britain, the United States protested. Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, sent a splendid letter to Russia on this subject. Among other things he said:

PROTEST BY MR. HAY.

Nor could the United States Government acquiesce in the treatment of raw cotton as absolutely contraband of war. While that product may enter to some extent into the manufacture of explosives and military clothing, the quantity of it used for such purposes is so far out of proportion to its uses in the arts of peace that the recognition of its treatment as absolutely contraband would, in principle, justify the same treatment of all forms of iron and steel, as well as wood, wool, all kinds of fuel, and all other materials which would be used in the manufacture of guns, carriages, or any other article of potentially military use, and would therefore be destructive of virtually all commerce of neutral States with the noncombatant population of belligerents. Cotton is one of the principal products of the United States. The crop for the year 1904 exceeds 12,000,000 bales. Its exportation from the United States is one of the principal items of its foreign commerce. To Japan alone the exportations of raw cotton during the periods specified were as follows:

	Raw cotton.		
	Bales.	Pounds.	Value.
Year ending Dec. 31, 1903.....	83,434	44,651,240	\$4,510,589
Eleven months ending Nov. 30, 1904.....	63,338	33,461,739	3,753,361

In view of the foregoing His Imperial Majesty's Government can not fail to perceive the deep concern with which the United States would view the establishment of precedents and the recognition of a principle which would work such disastrous consequences to its legitimate commerce with neutral States. According to the view of the United States Government expressed herein and in its circular of June 10 and its instructions of August 30 and September 1 last, the seizure and condemnation of neutral ships and goods on the broad grounds enunciated by Count Lamsdorff, would necessitate a radical change in the law of nations and in the procedure of prize tribunals, and would, if generally adopted, inflict incalculable injury upon great producing and exporting countries, like Russia and the United States, who are vitally concerned in the maintenance of the rights of legitimate commerce with the peoples of belligerent States.

Russia yielded, and the one exception of an effort by a nation to make cotton contraband having been abandoned by that nation on the protests of neutrals, emphasizes the rule that the customs of nations has fixed cotton as a commodity which can not be made contraband.

The story has been heralded by the press that Germany has declared cotton absolute contraband. I called on the State Department to verify it. They could not do it. They had no such notice, and they cabled Berlin for information, and the reply was that the statement was false. Yet there is a class of newspaper men who pick up anything they can to start and circulate it in the effort to justify the illegal conduct of Great Britain. It is not patriotic to be hunting for an opportunity to strike the commerce of your own country, and I am not proud of the men who do it.

DECLARATION OF LONDON.

The declaration of London covering the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare was signed February 26, 1909. It is gratifying to see that the press of the country is beginning to recognize the great value of the declaration of London as an authority upon the rules of naval warfare.

Still it is worth repeating that this declaration was prepared by the representatives of the 10 great naval powers of the world. They were called together at the instance of Great Britain to consider and, if possible, agree as to what were the correct rules of international law applicable to those branches of naval warfare submitted to them.

There were 40 delegates present chosen from England, France, Germany, Austria, Russia, Japan, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and the United States. Among their number were authors of distinction, naval officers who had made a specialty of the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare, professors of international law from great universities, and the counsellors of the state department of Great Britain.

The rules of international law which they announced were unanimously agreed to by them.

These rules classified contraband as "absolute" and "conditional" contraband.

They make a list of those commodities which by the customs of nations, on account of their general use for peaceful purposes, no nation is authorized to make contraband. They declare that the "free list" which they present can not be made contraband by any belligerent, and this free list is headed with "raw cotton."

BRITISH SUPPORTED CLASSIFICATION OF COTTON ON FREE LIST.

The British representatives to this conference, in a letter to their Government with reference to contraband, reported on March 30, 1909:

We . . . have secured the addition of a free list which will place it beyond the power of belligerents in the future to treat as contraband the raw material of some of the most important of our national industries.

When the declaration of London was considered by the House of Commons during the year 1911, the representatives of the Government prided themselves upon the fact that the London conference had placed cotton upon the free list, thereby preventing any belligerent in the future from ever treating cotton in any way as contraband. The opposition to the Government ridiculed the claim that this was valuable, because they insisted cotton was already established upon the free list by the recognized customs of nations.

Upon this subject Mr. Balfour said:

They pride themselves on having prevented cotton and wool and other things from being made contraband of war, and so far as I can make out only because one nation, again ineffectively and for a very brief time, said that cotton might be regarded as conditional contraband.

And Mr. Cave, one of the able lawyers of the House of Commons, in support of his contention that no nation could make cotton contraband, said:

A thing can not be made contraband unless it is declared contraband by the belligerent power and the claim is accepted by the neutral power. After all, treating a thing as contraband is taking away property—goods and possibly the ship—of other nations with which you have no quarrel at all, and in order to establish that you must have the assent of that nation to the transaction as a whole. Neutral nations agree to form a kind of ring around the two parties who are at war and not to assist either by sending goods which will help them in their warlike operations. The mere fact that one of the two nations says, "These goods assist my enemy in his operations," does not make those goods contraband. It is always a subject of controversy between neutrals and belligerent nations as to whether the neutrals will accept a declaration of contraband.

Great Britain has by a municipal regulation sought to make cotton absolute contraband.

The order making cotton absolute contraband was not only in violation of the customs of nations but in violation of the protest of Great Britain to Russia when Russia made cotton contraband in 1904.

It disregarded the provision of the declaration of London, which only permitted a belligerent to make absolute contraband goods which could be used alone for military purposes.

This provision of the declaration of London followed the instructions from the British Government to her delegates to this

conference, which advised them that it must be conceded under rules of international law that no belligerent could make anything absolute contraband which could be used for other than military purposes.

We may well protest the legality of the order of August 21, 1915, by the privy council of Great Britain making cotton absolute contraband.

It is the greatest export commodity produced in the United States. In the past century we have sold the export of cotton for \$16,750,000,000. It is now, with its legitimate markets open and including cotton seed, a crop worth \$1,000,000,000 a year. It furnishes employment in its culture and its manufacture to more people in the United States than any other commodity. We have no national asset of greater value.

ORDER HAS NOT SO FAR HURT COTTON.

It is true that the passage of the order making cotton absolute contraband last August did not of itself interfere with cotton shipments, but this was only because already, by the illegal orders of the privy council of Great Britain of March 1 and 11, 1915, the neutral ports of northern Europe had been blockaded.

All the commerce of citizens of the United States was, by these blockade orders of March 1 and 11, shut out from Germany and Austria, so that an order in August making cotton absolute contraband did not itself shut cotton out of Germany and Austria. It had already been shut out months before by the illegal blockade orders.

ANIMUS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

In this connection I call attention to the report of Consul General Robert P. Skinner, of London, which, on page 1055, reads as follows:

It continues to be the case that many classes of goods, the exportation of which from the United States to neutral countries is attended with great difficulty and hazard, are going forward freely from Great Britain to the same countries, and in some cases in largely increased quantities. * * * Exports of cotton, as reported under the cotton statistics act of 1868, were as follows up to August 5, 1915:

To August 5, 1915.....	American bales.	220, 847
To July 30, 1914.....		106, 382

During the months of March and August, 1915, inclusive, Great Britain, while seizing cargoes of cotton belonging to citizens of the United States and taking them into British ports, there to be sold, permitted her own citizens to ship 95,000 bales of cotton to Holland and Sweden alone, although the year previous they shipped only 6,200 bales during the same period.

Interference with shipments by citizens of the United States was lawless. The purpose of the interference is shown when citizens of Great Britain are permitted to ship American cotton to these points from which American citizens were excluded.

Sir Edward Grey and the British ambassador have sought to excuse this misconduct by pointing to increased shipments by American citizens to neutral countries of northern Europe during the year 1915. These shipments were made principally in January and February. They were not made after the British blockade was put into effect.

During the month of February, 1915, citizens of the United States shipped cotton to Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Germany to the amount of 450,000 bales.

The shipments in March, 1915, were seized and carried into British ports.

Shipments for April last dropped to 45,000 bales. Few of these reached their destination.

Shipments for May and June dropped to 25,000 bales, and finally efforts to ship cotton were practically abandoned.

There was a demand for a million bales of cotton owned by citizens of the United States in these countries from March to July. The illegal conduct of Great Britain cut off this market for the 1914 crop and cut off a market for 3,000,000 bales of the 1915 crop.

HISTORY OF COTTON SHIPMENTS SINCE WAR BEGAN.

There has been a continuous assault made upon the American cotton product in Great Britain since the war began.

During the fall of 1914 constant reports were circulated, apparently by authority in London, that cotton was about to be made contraband.

British marine insurance companies declined to insure cotton sailing to the ports of northern Europe.

The ports of Germany were not blockaded, and yet no cotton sailed to them. Practically no cotton sailed to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, or Holland.

The price of cotton in the United States fell to 6 cents a pound and less, while cotton in Germany was reported to be selling at over 20 cents a pound.

Finally, a resolution was introduced in the Senate on October 22, 1914, providing for the appointment of a committee which should seek through the State Department a formal declaration

from the British Government avowing its purposes with reference to cotton.

On the 26th of October, 1914, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice wrote Mr. Lansing, then Acting Secretary of State, as follows:

Last night I received a reply from Sir Edward Grey, in which he authorizes me to give the assurance that cotton will not be seized. He points out that cotton has not been put in any of our lists of contraband, and, as your department must be aware from the draft proclamation now in your possession, it is not proposed to include it in our new list of contraband. It is, therefore, as far as Great Britain is concerned, in the free list, and will remain there.

Mr. GALLINGER. What was the date of that answer, I will ask the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was October 26, 1914. The absolute promise from the British Government less than two years ago in connection with this war, when possibly they did not know that Germany no longer needed cotton to make powder, was "cotton is on the free list, and will remain there."

Ah, the blush of shame must come to the cheeks of great Englishmen who for the past 20 years have been the exponents of international law, who have been the great leaders in defense of the rights of neutrals. They laid down the rules so clearly that the violation by Great Britain now is apparent. Surely Great Britain, on second thought, will rejoice once more to lead as the nation devoted to law.

This statement, furnished by Great Britain October 26, 1914, was freely circulated among cotton merchants, shipowners, and institutions in a position to finance cotton shipments.

By December cotton began to sail, with a German and Austrian destination. During the months of December, January, and February those two countries absorbed two and a quarter million bales of cotton raised in the United States.

The price of cotton began to rise, and by the early spring it had reached 10 cents a pound.

Then came the seizure of cotton under the illegal orders of Great Britain, passed March 1 and 11; cotton went down 2 cents a pound.

Later on it was discovered that the crop of 1915 was nearly 6,000,000 bales less than the crop of 1914. Besides this, the farmers had raised ample foodstuffs and were prepared to hold their cotton.

The facilities for financing loans afforded by the Federal Reserve System was another valuable aid in protecting the crop from sacrifice, and in spite of the lawless conduct of Great Britain, a fair price per pound for an ordinary-sized crop was obtained by the cotton farmers.

With their markets open, in view of the very short crop, the price would have been sufficient to have enabled them to recover some of their serious losses of the previous year.

Then, another thing is affecting the production of cotton, and that is that no potash now comes in from Germany. Nearly one-half the cotton land will practically yield little or no cotton without such an application. You can not grow cotton on some land without potash.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator means that cotton can not be grown on sandy soil without potash.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes. I was just going on to say that the land without potash is a sandy loam. In certain sections of our States where clay is found potash also is found, but in our sandy-loam lands the application of some potash by artificial addition is necessary. That is certainly the case in my own State, and I suppose it is so everywhere.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is true everywhere.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; and the inability to obtain potash, with the consequent reduction in the size of the crop, has helped to keep up the price of cotton. The customs of nations had freed cotton shipped by neutrals to belligerents from seizure. It had placed it upon a free list, which could not be made contraband and could not be subject to seizure.

Great Britain led in the protest when Russia undertook to make cotton contraband, and forced Russia to permit cotton to pass free.

Forty distinguished students of international law, meeting at the instance of Great Britain to codify the rules of international law applicable to naval warfare, unanimously agreed that cotton should head the list of items free from seizure by belligerents and which no belligerent could make contraband.

When the declaration of London was before the House of Commons in 1911 all members of the House of Commons who spoke upon the subject took the position that cotton could not be made contraband by a belligerent and must be permitted to pass free.

As late as October 26, 1914, the British Government assured our Government that cotton is, "as far as Great Britain is concerned, in the free list and will remain there."

Are we quietly to submit? Are we to permit the rights of the people of this country in commerce to be ruthlessly and knowingly disregarded? I come now to foodstuffs.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator from Georgia if I should ask him a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am intensely interested in this discussion, because I believe that Great Britain has gone very far beyond her rights in one direction during the progress of this European war. I will therefore ask the Senator if the State Department of this administration holds a different view from what the Senator himself does on this subject; and, if it does not, has any earnest effort been made to correct the existing condition of things?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will answer the Senator from New Hampshire. I introduced my remarks by a clear, clean, intense protest against the legality of the course of Great Britain made by the administration. The letter of March 30 is strong and emphatic. Again, the letter of October asserts our rights in the plainest and most forcible way. The position already taken by the State Department is in entire accord with every view of the law which I have presented. I am simply seeking before the Senate and the country to support those declarations of our legal right in a more elaborate way than a state paper could properly do.

FOODSTUFFS.

I wish now to bring to the attention of the Senate the illegal manner in which Great Britain has treated the commerce of neutrals in foodstuffs during the present war.

Foodstuffs have been classified uniformly as conditional contraband. Under this classification they could only be seized by a belligerent, according to the view of most nations, when they were sailing to a port of an enemy, and when the proof showed that they were there to be used by the armed forces of the enemy. If the proof failed to show that the foodstuffs were not to be used by noncombatants, then the foodstuffs had the right, shipped by neutrals, to enter a belligerent country, and no opposing belligerent had the right to seize them.

Great Britain has been seizing foodstuffs since the winter of 1914, even if they were sailing to neutral ports and without any proof that they were going to a belligerent country for the use of the military or naval forces of the opposing belligerent.

Millions of dollars of goods belonging to citizens of the United States have been ordered confiscated by the prize courts of Great Britain, when the goods were shipped to Sweden and to other neutral countries, with no proof presented that they were going to the military or naval forces of Germany or Austria or of any belligerent opposing Great Britain.

This conduct of Great Britain was used by Germany as a pretext for the submarine warfare, which was declared to be a retaliatory measure.

In February the United States addressed letters to each of the Governments urging that each withdraw from the respective lines of conduct just mentioned. Germany practically agreed to accept the proposition and Great Britain refused.

ILLEGAL ORDER OF PRIVY COUNCIL.

I have no doubt that the basis for the decision of the English prize courts is found in the order of the British privy council of October 29, 1914, which directs the following modification of the declaration of London:

PAR. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of article 35 of the declaration of London, conditional contraband shall be liable to capture on board a vessel bound for a neutral port if the goods are consigned to order, or if the ship's papers do not show who is the consignee of the goods, or if they show a consignee of the goods in territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy.

PAR. 4. In cases covered by the preceding paragraph it shall lie upon the owners of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

Paragraph 35 of the declaration of London provides:

Conditional contraband is not liable to capture except when found on board a vessel bound for territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy, or for the armed forces of the enemy, when it is not to be discharged in an intervening neutral port.

This provision in the declaration of London was unquestionably a correct statement of the recognized rule of international law.

The British orders just quoted directed the naval forces of that country and the prize courts of that country to abandon the rules of international law which distinguished absolute from conditional contraband.

Under the rules of international law foodstuffs could not be seized when sailing upon a vessel bound to a neutral port. By this order England determined to seize them, though sailing to a neutral port.

According to the rules of international law, a neutral could ship foodstuffs to Germany or Austria, unless it was proven to be going for the use of the military or naval forces of Germany or Austria. By this order Great Britain directed that foodstuffs should be seized if going through a neutral port consigned to private citizens in Germany or Austria. If the foodstuffs were going at all into Germany or Austria, Great Britain directed their seizure.

According to the rules of international law, the burden was upon the belligerent seizing foodstuffs to prove that they were to be used by the army or navy of the opposing belligerent.

By this order Great Britain directed foodstuffs seized and confiscated when shipped to a neutral port if consigned to order, or to consignees in Germany, or if the ship's papers did not show who was the consignee of the goods, and also required the owners of the goods to prove that their destination was innocent.

It was a clear case of action by the privy council of Great Britain, which has authority to legislate upon this subject for that Government alone, setting up an illegal regulation to be enforced against the citizens of other nationalities in utter disregard of their rights under the rules of international law.

GREAT BRITAIN CONDEMNED BY HER OWN PRECEDENTS.

Again, I will rely upon English authority to show the lawlessness of this course pursued for more than 12 months past and still pursued by Great Britain.

In 1885 the French Government announced its intention of treating rice as contraband when destined to Chinese ports north of Canton.

Lord Granville, British foreign secretary, declared that the—British Government could not admit that provisions could be treated as contraband of war merely because they were consigned to a belligerent port. The British Government—

Said his lordship—

did not deny that provisions might acquire a contraband character under particular circumstances, as if they should be consigned directly to the fleet of a belligerent or to a port where such fleet was lying, but that there must, in any event, be circumstances relative to any particular cargo, or its destination, to displace the presumption that articles of this kind are intended for the ordinary use of life, and to show *prima facie*, at all events, that they are destined for military use, before they could be treated as contraband.

Lord Granville further stated:

His Majesty's Government feel themselves bound to reserve their right of protest at once against the doctrine that it is for the belligerent to decide what is and what is not contraband of war, regardless of the well-established rights of neutrals.

Lord Salisbury thus defined the position of His Majesty's Government on the question of foodstuffs:

Foodstuffs, with a hostile destination, can be considered contraband of war only if they are supplies for the enemy's forces. It is not sufficient that they are capable of being so used; it must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of the seizure.

When the Russian Government undertook during the Russo-Japanese war to treat foodstuffs as contraband, Lord Lansdowne protested that His Majesty's Government observed "with great concern that rice and provisions will be treated as unconditionally contraband, a step which they regard as inconsistent with the law and practice of nations. His Majesty's Government," said Lord Lansdowne, did not contest "that, in particular circumstances, provisions may acquire a contraband character, as, for instance, if they should be consigned direct to the army or fleet of a belligerent, or to a port where such fleet may be lying"; but that His Majesty's Government could not admit "that if such provisions were consigned to the port of a belligerent (even though it should be a port of naval equipment) they should therefore be necessarily regarded as contraband of war."

BRITISH STATESMEN SHOW FOODSTUFF SHOULD GO THROUGH NEUTRAL PORTS TO GERMANY.

During the debate in the House of Commons growing out of the action of Russia, Mr. Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. A. J. Balfour, spoke as follows:

MR. BRYCE. Food, by the general consent of nations, was not contraband of war unless it could be clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes. As one well-known authority had declared, it was unjustifiable so to treat it merely because of some uncertainty as to its ultimate destination.

SIR CHARLES DILKE. As regarded the attempt of Russia to treat food and raw material under all circumstances as contraband of war simply because they were destined for Japan, that was impossible for this country to accept.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR. I must express on my own behalf a general concurrence with the views on international law expressed by all of the honorable gentlemen who have spoken.

The Russian Government yielded.

ROYAL ENGLISH COMMISSION ON FOODSTUFFS.

The English Government appointed a royal commission in 1904 to consider the question of supply of food and raw material for Great Britain in time of war.

This commission consisted of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and 20 other leading English statesmen.

Among other things, their report contained the following statements:

As regards foodstuffs, the rule of the British and United States prize courts is that which was most fully expounded by Lord Stowell in the case of the *Jonge Margaretha*. "I take," he said, "the modern established rule to be this, that generally they (provisions) are not contraband, but may become so under circumstances arising out of the particular situation of the war. * * * The most important distinction is whether the articles were intended for the ordinary use of life or even for mercantile ships' use or whether they were going with a highly probable destination to military use." Prof. Holland states as follows the rule which, in his opinion, has all but won its way to universal acceptance:

"Provisions in neutral ships may be intercepted by a belligerent as contraband only when, being suitable for the purpose, they are on their way to a port of naval or military equipment belonging to the enemy, or occupied by the enemy's naval or military forces, or to the enemy's ships at sea, or when they are destined for the relief of a port besieged by such belligerent."

It is, however, necessary to call attention to action taken by two powers on recent occasions not in accordance with the rule as thus stated. France in 1885 announced her intention of treating rice as contraband in her war with China, on the ground of its importance as food of the Chinese people and army, conduct the more remarkable because during the whole history of international law France had been distinguished by her refusal to admit the contraband character of provisions under any circumstances. The British Government protested, but, owing to the rapid termination of the war, the controversy was carried no further.

Russia, as has been already mentioned, at the commencement of the present war went so far as to include foodstuffs in her list of absolutely contraband articles, mentioning specifically "rice, all kinds of grain, fish, fish products, beans, bean oil, and oil cake." She has, however, receded from this position in consequence of strongly expressed protests from several of the powers, Great Britain and the United States in particular, and, in accordance with the advice of a commission presided over by Prof. de Martens, has undertaken that these articles will henceforth be regarded only as conditionally contraband, according to the use to which they are to be applied.

Lord Lansdowne's dispatch of June 1, 1904, stated that "His Majesty's Government observe with great concern that rice and provisions will be treated as unconditionally contraband, a step which they regard as inconsistent with the law and practice of nations." Mr. Hay's note of August 30, with reference to the judgment of Vladivostok prize court, confiscating as contraband the cargo of the *Arabia*, consisting of railway material and flour consigned to private commercial houses in Japan, spoke of that judgment as "rendered in disregard of the settled law of nations in respect of what constitutes contraband of war." He proceeds to state as "a substantive principle of the law of nations" that "articles which, like arms and ammunition, are by their nature of self-evident warlike use, are contraband if destined for the enemy's territory, but articles which, like coal, cotton, and provisions, though of ordinarily innocent, are capable of warlike use, are not subject to capture and confiscation unless shown by evidence to be actually destined for the military or naval forces of a belligerent. The Russian claim," he adds, "obliterates the necessity of blockade, renders meaningless the principles of the declaration of Paris that a blockade to be binding must be effective, obliterates all distinction between contraband and non-contraband goods, and is in effect a declaration of war against commerce of every description between the people of a neutral and those of a belligerent State."

The interest of neutral nations in the maintenance of international law (especially if the nation interested is strong enough to enforce its views) affords a further and increasingly potent guaranty of its being duly observed. It is, for instance, hardly to be expected that a neutral nation, if able to resent it, would tolerate the seizure as contraband of goods which had previously been recognized by international law as innocent. It should be remembered also that the nation which we should have the greatest reason to hope would be neutral, were Great Britain engaged in war, the United States of America, is also that which, in such a case, would be most interested in maintaining those neutral rights of which it has ever been the foremost advocate.

So it will be seen that Great Britain did not permit Russia to treat foodstuffs as subject to seizure simply because they were sailing to Japan when Russia was at war with Japan. They required Russia to show affirmatively that the particular foodstuffs were to be used by the army and navy of Japan, and not by the noncombatant population of Japan.

This could not be proved except in the rarest cases, so foodstuffs went to Japan, as Russia yielded to the British contention.

The United States took exactly the same position, and Russia also yielded to the view of the United States Government.

MR. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to inquire whether or not, if the embargo were relieved as to foodstuffs, the Senator believes there would be any risk or danger in allowing foodstuffs to pass, arising from the possibility of including in such cargoes material that might be used for military purposes?

MR. SMITH of Georgia. That is a possibility. If it took place and the vessel were caught, the vessel and the cargo would be forfeited. If, in point of fact, they undertook to hide in a vessel sailing from the United States real contraband of war and they were caught, they would forfeit the ship and forfeit the goods. They would all be confiscated. That is the restriction against such reckless conduct.

I should be glad to have our inspectors at the ports see what is in the vessels and see that the manifest is true and publish it at once to the world. Give us our rights, nothing more; and give us our rights with an open hand. This would stop the possible illegal shipments suggested.

The House of Commons in 1911 had under consideration the declaration of London. The Government was urging its adoption. The opposition to the Government was opposing it.

The fight made upon the declaration by the opposition to the Government was principally because foodstuffs had not been put upon the free list where no belligerent could ever make them contraband of any character.

Mr. McKinnon Wood was undersecretary of state in charge of the debate for the Government. I will give a number of interesting expressions during that debate from members of Parliament, now leaders in Great Britain, which show how utterly Great Britain is disregarding the rights of neutrals and how fully these British leaders know that the rights of neutrals in the treatment of foodstuffs are being disregarded.

Mr. McKinnon Wood. * * * We tried at the peace conference to have food placed on the free list. We could not secure an approach to international agreement. The declaration of London places it on the list, in accordance with the old-established British doctrine—or, at any rate, our doctrine for a long time now. * * *

Mr. McKenna. * * * He admits, and I admit with him, that in general practice food has only been conditional contraband, the condition depending upon whether it was intended for the armed forces of the enemy. * * * The declaration of London declares that food may become contraband under precisely these conditions. * * *

Sir Edward Grey. * * * If food is to be declared absolute contraband, so that all food coming to any commercial port is to be stopped by a belligerent, the belligerent can only do that by driving a coach and four through what is the plain meaning of the declaration of London.

It will be observed that Mr. McKinnon Wood had stated that the provision of the declaration of London was in accordance with the old-established British doctrine—that is to say, the rule of international law—with reference to foodstuffs long recognized by Great Britain.

Sir Edward Grey, therefore, declares that a belligerent could only stop all food going to a commercial port by driving a "coach and four" through the plain meaning of "the old-established British doctrine."

Mr. Balfour. * * * There are great continental countries which habitually import such corn as they require through neutral ports. They can not be touched under this declaration. * * * The old practice and the old theory were that it was only when corn was actually being obviously imported for the use of soldiers or ports of equipment or the use of fortresses that then, and then only, we had any right to treat it as contraband. * * *

It will be observed that Mr. Balfour declared that under the old theory—that is to say, the established rules of international law—corn (foodstuffs) could only be treated as contraband—that is to say, seized by a belligerent—when it was being imported for the use of soldiers or ports of equipment or a fortress.

Great Britain has seized foodstuffs belonging to citizens of the United States and has confiscated them simply because it was claimed that they were going to Germany. Not that they were going for the use of the soldiers, but because they were going to Germany, even though they were to be used by the non-combatant population of Germany.

Mr. Balfour is to-day secretary of the navy of Great Britain.

Mr. Bonar Law. They have to prove, as we have to prove, that food is destined for the armed forces of the other side.

Mr. Bonar Law is one of the leading statesmen of Great Britain, and he declares that food can only be stopped when Great Britain proves that it is destined for the armed forces of Germany.

Mr. Gallinger. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. Gallinger. And in contravention of that rule, if I read the matter correctly, Great Britain has placed an embargo upon the exportation of milk to the babies of Germany at the present time.

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. Gallinger. They must be noncombatants.

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Unquestionably. The truth is, Senators, we all know that Germany has provided her army with all the foodstuffs it needs. The resources of that country are ample for the army, and everybody knows the army will be cared for first. This interference with foodstuffs does not touch the army.

Great Britain is seizing foodstuffs simply because it is going to Germany, and seizes it going to a neutral port, unless the neutral citizen owning it can prove that it is not going to Germany.

During the debate in Commons in 1911 the following statements were made:

Mr. Atherly Jones. What is the law, and let the right honorable gentleman, the undersecretary, correct me if I am not stating the law aright. When I speak of law, it has no sanction except that of usage. It is a mere custom of law, but it has very powerful sanction. It has this powerful sanction that the common sense of Europe has justified the law, and justified it so far that it has never, except in one or two extravagant cases, been violated. The law is that foodstuffs, unless car-

ried to a port of naval or military equipment, can not be seized—I mean foodstuffs in neutral vessels. That is absolutely unequivocal, and I think unanimously recognized to be the law of Europe.

Mr. Atherly Jones is one of the most distinguished law writers in Great Britain. He declares that foodstuffs can not be seized unless being carried to a port of naval or military equipment of Germany.

Mr. Butcher. I think my honorable friend who has spoken has laid down the law with absolute clearness when he said that the general modern practice of nations for a hundred years has been to treat food not as contraband, liable to seizure in any circumstance, but as conditional contraband, liable to seizure only when it is proved to be intended for the armed force of the enemy. We have the opinion of one undersecretary to-night; let me read the opinion of another Liberal undersecretary for foreign affairs, a man whose authority as a jurist and a statesman none of us would dispute. I refer to the Right Hon. James Bryce. He said, from his place in this House, on August 11, 1904: "Food, by the general consent of the nations, was not contraband unless it was clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes."

Does the right honorable gentleman dispute the accuracy of the statement of Mr. Bryce? It has gone unchallenged in the House of Commons until to-day, and not a single jurist or anyone else has challenged it until it was challenged by the undersecretary this afternoon.

Mr. Butcher is a distinguished English statesman and law writer. He indorses the view of Viscount James Bryce that food could only be seized when clearly proved to be intended for military or naval purposes.

Mr. Shirley Benn. One case in which a country tried to starve another country into submission was our own case, in 1795, when that celebrated order in council was issued instructing British cruisers to capture all vessels going into any French port that had food supplies on board. Our captains captured some, but what was the result? The United States complained that it was not legal, and the matter was left to a mixed commission, and that commission decided that it was not legal, and England had to pay not only for the value of the goods but also for the loss of market and detention. The second case was the one referred to in the House this afternoon, when France, in her war with China, declared that any rice going to any port north of Canton should be considered as contraband. What was the result? Lord Granville, the Liberal foreign minister, promptly issued a proclamation to the effect that no decision of a prize court carrying out such a doctrine would be recognized by England, and the result was that it was not carried out.

Mr. Shirley Benn, another prominent English statesman, not only agrees with those to whom I have already referred, but he further concedes the fact that, when in 1795 British cruisers seized a vessel of the United States carrying foodstuffs, solely because it was going into a French port, France being then engaged in war with Great Britain, the case was left to a mixed commission, and this commission decided that the seizure was illegal, and England not only had to pay the value of the goods, but for the loss of market and detention.

I wish, however, to read a few extracts from one of the speeches made on the floor of Parliament in 1911. It is from Sir Robert Finlay. After showing that foodstuffs could go to a neutral nation without molestation and that they could go to a belligerent port without molestation unless they were shown to be intended for the army or navy of the belligerent, he then concludes in this way. Just listen—

Mr. Colt. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. Colt. I have listened with great interest to the argument of the Senator from Georgia, and I should like to ask him whether he does not think that, as the rules of municipal law are suspended in time of war, so the rules of international law are in part suspended by a belligerent in time of war; that a nation at war is in a fever or delirium where so-called rules of law, which may be made in times of peace, seem of comparatively little consequence compared with the great issue of preserving the national life; and hence that belligerents will seize upon any ambiguity in an international rule or upon any forced construction in order that they may in fact suspend the rule; and that the great defect in international law is that nations at war will not obey rules of conduct agreed to in times of peace?

Mr. Smith of Georgia. Mr. President and Senators, nations, like men, are likely to be lawless if they see no danger to themselves from being lawless. Nations in times of war may be disposed to disregard law if there is no power to call them and make them regard it. But we saw in the Russo-Japanese War the power of Great Britain to call Russia when she desired by a municipal regulation to set aside international law. Russia was called, and she came back to the law. And so it may be to-day that the lawless in Great Britain have intimidated the believers in law and persuaded them to issue these illegal municipal regulations. It needs but the power of the United States, as the great neutral, to assert the rights of neutrals, and we will find the great statesmen of England glad to come back in the conduct of English affairs to the recognition of those rules of international law that they have contributed so much to create.

Now, let me read to you, from an English statesman, his opinion of what Great Britain could rely upon. I want the Senator from Rhode Island to hear what the English statesman thought Great Britain could rely upon to see that the rules of international law were enforced if Great Britain was at war. It had been suggested that while the rules of international law gave the privilege of these shipments of raw materials and foodstuffs, some other belligerent might wish to violate them. Now, let me show you where Great Britain put her reliance that the rules of international law would be enforced that would give her the supplies she needed. I read from Sir Robert Finlay, near the close of the debate upon the declaration of London in 1909:

Sir R. FINLAY. The law of conditional contraband is perfectly clear. It has always been held in this country, it has always been held in the United States, and it has been laid down authoritatively that food is contraband only if it is for the army or the fleet, and is in consequence of that part of naval or military equipment. A very able writer on international law, Mr. Hall, says the opposite view is not arguable, and a right honorable gentleman of considerable authority in these matters to whom honorable gentlemen on the other side might be disposed to listen, Mr. Bryce, our ambassador at Washington, expressed himself on this subject on the 11th of August, 1904, in a debate in the house in these terms:

"Food, by the general consent of nations, was not contraband of war unless it is clearly proved to be for military or naval purposes. In 1885 an attempt was made by France to treat rice as contraband of war. Lord Granville protested in the most energetic manner, and in point of fact rice never was treated as contraband of war."

That authority is one which, I think, is amply borne out by a more extended view of the law on this point, into which on this occasion I do not intend, of course, to enter.

Will any honorable gentleman say that any power at war with us would be likely to provoke the displeasure of the United States by declaring that corn carried in a United States vessel to this country should be absolute contraband of war? Not only is the law on the matter clear, but it has behind it, so far as we are concerned, a sanction of the most effective kind, for happily, I think, we may dismiss the very idea of the possibility of war between this country and the United States as not within the range of practical politics, and as long as we are not at war with the United States we may depend upon it that no country, however powerful, would incur the displeasure and the possible hostility of such a power as the United States by putting forward an unfounded claim to treat food brought to this country as contraband of war.

This exposition by Sir R. Finlay needs little comment. He told the British Parliament, in 1911, that no country, however powerful, would incur the displeasure, and possible hostility, of such a power as the United States by putting forward an unfounded claim to treat food brought to Great Britain as contraband of war.

I wonder what he thinks of the United States now, when we submit not only to the seizure of vessels destined to German ports carrying foodstuffs, but to the seizure of vessels destined to neutral ports of Holland and Sweden and permit Great Britain, disregarding rules of international law, by orders from the privy council, which must be followed by her prize courts, to confiscate cargoes of foodstuffs belonging to citizens of the United States with no proof whatever that they were intended for the military or naval forces of Germany?

Germany and Austria have a population of over 110,000,000 people. It is estimated that perhaps 10 per cent of these are under arms. Certainly over 90,000,000 people in these two countries are noncombatants.

By every rule of international law citizens of the United States have the right to ship to these noncombatants for their use, through the neutral ports of northern Europe, all the foodstuffs they wish to buy. The same is equally true of raw cotton.

Raw cotton is the great commodity used to clothe the world. So that Great Britain is suppressing the shipment of foodstuffs and clothing to the noncombatant population of her enemy, in utter defiance of established rules of international law, in utter defiance of rules which all of her present statesmen have within the past five years declared to be the correct rules of international law, and rules which they insist Great Britain, in case of war, could safely rely upon, because the United States would not permit them to be broken.

Only a partial knowledge of German and Austrian resources will convince all that these countries have ample internal resources to produce foodstuffs and clothing to fully supply the men under arms.

They will also supply the noncombatants to an extent which may bring pinches from want, but will not destroy. To this there may be one exception—young children may die for lack of milk.

Great Britain can not hope to accomplish anything so far as the immediate effect of the war is concerned by this lawlessness. We may find a reason for their course so far as cotton is concerned. The manufacture and exportation of cotton fabrics has been a great industry in Germany. The marvelous skill of these people as mechanics, their superiority as chemists have

made markets in the world for their manufactured products which have seriously encroached upon English commerce.

If cotton can be kept out of Germany and the exports from Germany suppressed, then perhaps England may capture this trade and help her own commerce.

PRESIDENT LONDON BOARD OF TRADE DEFINES POSITION.

The frankness with which the president of the London Board of Trade, in a speech before the House of Commons on January 9, proclaimed the purposes of Great Britain almost staggers comprehension.

Let me give a few extracts. He declared that—

England will assault Germany's trade now and after the war. * * * We must keep control of the world's coal; we must secure control of the supply of oil. While the war is on we must do everything in our power to destroy German finance, credit, and trade * * * so that after the war Germany does not have the opportunity of reorganizing her commercial system before our trade has begun to flow in ever-increasing volume. * * * We must make it clear, however, that when peace comes we will not permit the outbreak of the economic war which Germany would wage against herself and our allies. * * * It has been all along the policy of the board of trade to capture German trade while the war is still on. In the case of South America, we have since the war begun developed a trade which, I hope, will continue long after the cessation of hostilities.

In the course of the debate there were some references to the danger of competition with the United States, to which John Halford Mackinder replied:

The member has spoken of America as a dangerous commercial rival, but I can not conceive of that competition taking the complex, scientific, and destructive form of Germany's competition.

On the day following this speech cable reports advised us that—

Insertion of a clause in the peace agreement binding Germany to refrain from all export business for a period of years is one of the methods suggested by British trade experts to cripple German trade after the war. Leading London business men generally approved the statement made by President Walter Runciman, of the board of trade, in commons last night that Great Britain must so cripple German commerce that the Germans can not again dispute world supremacy with the British nation.

The commercial rights of citizens of the United States and of other neutrals are being recklessly disregarded by Great Britain. They are being disregarded in part to destroy Germany commercially and in part to advance the trade of Great Britain.

Shall we quietly continue to furnish Great Britain what she is compelled to obtain from the United States while the commercial rights of citizens of this country are trampled under foot?

Great Britain can not continue the war without munitions from the United States.

Great Britain can not feed her population without foodstuffs from the United States and other neutrals.

Great Britain can not keep her million and a half people engaged in the Lancashire mills at work 60 days without cotton from the United States.

Great Britain can not accomplish her scheme for world-wide domination of commerce in her vast products of cotton-manufactured fabrics without cotton from the United States.

The administration has forcefully brought to the attention of Great Britain the rights of citizens of this country.

It has been demonstrated that citizens of neutral countries have the right to ship foodstuffs and cotton in unlimited quantities through the neutral ports of northern Europe to the non-combatant inhabitants of Germany and Austria.

The Congress of the United States slept over the right of shippers of foodstuffs last winter. This was perhaps because the prices were good, perhaps because we did not investigate the subject.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho? Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Does not the Senator think that Great Britain, of course, realizing that she can not carry on her war without munitions from the United States, and foodstuffs, and so forth, also understands that the United States will not forego the business opportunity of supplying those things to Great Britain, and that therefore she does not feel uneasy about the situation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. She may think that is true, and she may think that these influences are so great that the United States would not, but she knows that we could do without shipments for 60 or 90 days, and she can not. She knows that we would be suspending profits while she would be going to absolute ruin. One word further, she knows that we are right and that she is wrong.

Mr. BORAH. But she understands, of course, that she is fighting for her existence and that we are unwilling to deny ourselves the opportunity which that situation presents.

I am delighted to hear the Senator's argument, but it is a practical question. Does the Senator believe that by any possibility we could pass through the Congress of the United States an inhibition against or an embargo upon the shipment of those things which Great Britain needs?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If I could have the support of the able Senator from Idaho, I would be glad to join him in passing such a provision—to go into effect in 30 days, unless Great Britain in the meantime receded from her orders in council and recognized our rights of international law.

Mr. BORAH. That would make two.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Here is another.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. With the support of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Arkansas we could well hope for the balance.

Mr. BORAH. I think I can, in the Senate, count five or six.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can count a good many more than that on this side.

Mr. BORAH. Then let us get to business; decide what it is wise and just to do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then let the Senator from Idaho give me one of his splendid speeches in support of this policy and we will go hand and shoulder together. I am simply presenting suggestions for the thought of the Senate now. I am seeking to lay the rights of our countrymen and the power of our country before you, and if the Senator from Idaho is ready to join I am more encouraged by that fact than by anything I have heard.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I manifested my disposition as to the shipment of munitions of war last year when the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] introduced his resolution. I will say to the Senator that I am perfectly willing, as a Senator, to take action both with reference to protecting our rights upon the sea and upon the land, on the ocean and in Mexico. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to assume the responsibility not of speech but of action. I have but one guide in these matters—the interests, rights, and safety of Americans. I am neither anti-English nor anti-German. Wherever American rights are invaded, American property destroyed, or American lives sacrificed, I am willing to proceed to action along any wise and effective line which will insure a recognition or respect of those rights and protection to the lives of our people. I realize that such things require reflection, but I have reflected and I am willing to vote upon effective measures now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I can not say how gratified I am to hear the expression of the Senator from Idaho. I had not heard it from him before, but I am not surprised. It is what I would expect from him, with my estimate of him as a man and a Senator.

The lawlessness of Great Britain has increased greatly during the past 12 months. Each day brings new evidence of disregard for neutral rights.

By firmness, but peacefully, neutrals can easily obtain their rights from both belligerents.

Paraphrasing the language of Mr. Jefferson, England may feel the desire of absorbing the commerce of Germany and of starving her people, but she can have no right of doing it at our loss or of making us the instrument of it.

Mr. President, I am in favor of enforcing our rights against all the belligerent nations. I am in favor of action by Congress which will let the belligerents understand that unless our rights are promptly regarded we will act, and such knowledge in London as the expressions of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] going to London will help those men in London who believe in the law. They will help bring a rescission from the illegal orders in council, for when they know that we are in earnest they must stop and think, and then return to the principles which they have so long advocated, and which they must find no pleasure to set aside.

APPENDIX.

ABSCHEFT CENTRALSTELLE FÜR
WISSENSCHAFTLICH-TECHNISCHE
UNTERSUCHUNGEN, G. M. B. H.,
Neubabelsberg, den 3. Dez. 1915.

HOWARD W. BIBLE, Esq.,
Hotel Adlon, Berlin.

SIR: An interesting chapter in the history of chemical industry will be the account of the technical achievements which have been produced during this great war.

Ever since the chemist Leblanc under the pressure of the continental blockade effected the manufacture of soda from cooking salt in France, the problem has often been solved in Germany of also making her independent of other countries by the manufacture of hitherto indispensable foreign products from native raw materials. Never, however, has the great creative power of chemical research

been so in evidence as in the course of this war in which the enemies of the central powers aim to conquer them by cutting off their supply of imported raw materials. Such materials which we used to import by sea in time of peace we now manufacture from the air surrounding us, from the water, and our native soil to an extent that makes us absolutely independent of other countries. Problems, the solution of which still seemed an impossibility only a few years ago, such as the manufacture of nitrogen products from the air, have matured to accomplished facts in the chemist's laboratory.

Therefore it seems astonishing that even learned scientists of foreign countries who are regarded as experts in the field of chemical research consider problems which we have long since solved as impossible of solution. Thus it is surprising when the opinion is expressed among well-known chemists in England that to shut off her supply of cotton could destroy Germany's defensive power, even force her to conclude peace within a few months because the lack of cotton would make the manufacture of the required amount of gunpowder impossible, and thus put us at the mercy of our enemies who were not hampered by such restrictions. (Ramsay, Times, Dec. 8, 1915: "Stop cotton and we should stop the war.")

Is that really the opinion of this scientist? Does he not know what every expert in explosives should know, that cotton cellulose, as used in the manufacture of ammunition, can in every respect be replaced by wood cellulose, an unlimited supply of which is always on hand in Germany? In time of peace Mr. Ramsay had ample opportunity to become acquainted with a large part of the German chemical industry. Does he really underestimate it so much that he does not consider it able to turn wood cellulose into a form in which it can be used instead of cotton for the manufacture of gunpowder?

It is true that a much more extensive cleaning of wood cellulose is necessary, if the existing machinery is to be used, and no time lost nor any more nitric acid consumed. It was necessary to give the manufacturers of cellulose some instruction in regard to the chemical and physical requirements of the product. But the fulfillment of these requirements presented no difficulty. The manufacture of nitrocellulose from wood fiber and its conversion into gunpowder, which is absolutely on a par with that made from cotton in respect of its durability and its ballistic properties, had long been solved in all its details in our laboratories. It had only to be transferred from the laboratory to the factories, which was not difficult, thanks to the expert knowledge of the chemists in the factories. Thus wood cellulose is since considerable time being used on a vast scale by the plants in the manufacture of nitrocellulose. The need for raw cotton is no longer felt in our gunpowder industry. The capacity of our cellulose factories exceeds many times the demand for cellulose for nitrating purposes.

After the war the world will learn of many great new achievements which our chemical industry had to and was able to accomplish in order to protect our German fatherland against all the efforts of the enemy to cut off its supply of food and ammunition. Many of these products will continue after the war is over. Even in times of peace they will be valuable in making us independent of foreign raw materials.

It looks very much as if the successes achieved by the cellulose industry will be among these.

Dr. W. WILL,

Professor at the University of Berlin;

Director of the Central Bureau for Technico-Scientific Research.

JANUARY 7, 1916.

HON. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Last October while in Washington I stated to you that during my visits to Germany, in the months of June, July, August, and September, 1915, I had been assured that cotton was no longer used in and no longer, in any sense, essential for, the manufacture of powder or explosives in Germany. As I was intending to return to Germany in November, I agreed to make a personal investigation of this subject and give you the results of that investigation. I also agreed that as soon as I reached a conclusion I would wire you, and I agreed with you upon a code to be used, in which the word "commodity" was to be substituted for the word "cotton" and the name "John Thomson" signed to the wire instead of my own. In pursuance of that agreement on December 4, 1915, after a full investigation of the subject in Germany, I sent you the following wireless message:

"Absolute evidence that commodity is not required. Substitute more effective, cheaper, and preferred for future use."

(Signed)

JOHN THOMSON.

Before sending this message I had made a most careful and unrestricted investigation of the present method of the manufacture of powder and explosives in Germany, and I satisfied myself that wood cellulose had been successfully substituted for cotton in the nitrating plants of Germany.

I reached Bremen November 28 and brought my desire for a personal investigation upon this subject at once to the attention of those largely interested in handling cotton in the Empire. I transmitted to them your request for information along the lines indicated, and they at once extended their cooperation and influence with the German Government in order that the facts might be secured.

A series of meetings were held in Bremen, and on Tuesday, December 1, President Alfred Lohman, of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce, accompanied me to Berlin for the purpose of presenting the case before the several departments of German Government, whose consent was necessary before the facts could be obtained and the necessary investigation conducted. It was arranged that I should appear before a meeting in Berlin, where the representatives of the several departments of the Government would be assembled to hear the presentation of your request that this information be furnished, and to determine whether or not it was to the interests of the German Government to comply therewith.

This meeting was held at the imperial foreign office December 3 at 5.30 p. m. It was recognized as a purely commercial matter, one involving the business interests of the United States and the German Empire, and was not regarded as an infraction of diplomatic usage.

There were present His Excellency Unterstaatssekretär Richter, Ministerial Director Müller, Geheimrat Dr. Mathies, department of Interior; Ministerial Director Johannes, Geheimrat Dr. Grunewald, imperial foreign office; Rittmeister Markwald, war department; Geheimrat Dr. Stimming, finance department; Captain Trapp and a scientific doctor, navy department; Alfred Lohman, president of the Bremen Chamber of Commerce.

These gentlemen gave the strictest attention to the subject of our several interviews and the correspondence that passed between us rela-

tive to the unlawful restriction placed upon cotton, which I presented at considerable length, placing particular emphasis upon the value of proof that cotton was in no wise an essential element to the progress of the war as a necessity for the manufacture of explosives.

At the conclusion of my remarks I was assured by all present that cotton was no longer used or necessary in Germany for the manufacture of powder or explosives, and that the German Government would gladly extend to me every facility for securing such proof as I deemed necessary, and which might be obtained by a careful inspection of the manufacture of explosives in one or more plants operated by the Imperial Government, the selection of such plant or plants being left entirely to me. I was given an outline of where the principal powder plants were located adjacent to Berlin and authorized to select for inspection any I might prefer. I decided on the morning of December 4 to inspect the *Kemiglichen Munitionsfabriken* at Spandau. Accompanied by President Lohman, I reached the above plant about 10 a. m. The inspection of the various departments was at once begun, and we were accompanied in this inspection by the commanding officer of the works, Maj. Gorke, of the German Army, and Mr. von der Bocks, *Königlicher Betriebsleiter der Technischen Instituten der Artillerie*.

The fullest access was given to all processes of the nitrating of cotton and cellulose and a notable freedom of investigation was a feature of our visit to this plant. We first inspected the warehouses utilized for the storing of the raw material for nitrating. The first warehouse visited was entered by a railroad track with platforms on either side, and bales of wood cellulose were at the time being unloaded from freight cars. I made a careful inspection of the entire platforms on either side and found nothing there but wood cellulose and rags. Going among this stock, I directed that several bales should be opened and samples of wood cellulose were secured from the following manufacturers:

1. Altdamm—Stahlhammer (Natronzellstoff).
2. Sulphide cellulose of the cellulose manufactory, Waldhof-Mannheim.
3. Sulphide cellulose of the A. G. für Maschinenpapier-fabrikation, Aschaffenburg.

4. Sulphide cellulose of the cellulose manufactory at Tilsit. We then secured samples of nitrating material from rags. These samples were marked with the manufacturers' names—"Jackson" and "Breitenau." Absolutely no cotton linters were found upon this level of the warehouse and only a few bales were in evidence on the upper floor. These had been in stock for some time and were placed at one side, having been definitely rejected in favor of the use of wood cellulose and rags.

In regard to the rags, would say that all evidence pointed to their early elimination as a material for nitrating. In fact, the incoming supplies were apparently confined to wood cellulose, and there was no evidence to support a contention that dependence was being placed on rags. Leaving the warehouses, we proceeded to the buildings which were employed for the use of drying nitrocellulose and rags. The two commodities were placed in small perforated iron receptacles, which were closely packed and passed to the drying process. A careful inspection of work under way disclosed a large preponderance of wood cellulose, as compared to rags. The work in this department was entirely done by women and girls. In passing from the drying building, we entered the departments where nitrating was in progress and inspected three houses devoted exclusively to the nitrating of wood cellulose and one devoted entirely to the nitrating of rags.

In all of these houses I made a careful inspection of the tanks, causing several to be opened and obtaining therefrom absolute evidence of the use of wood cellulose or rags, as the case might be. Furthermore, I examined the pipe conveyers and ascertained the contents thereof, and in each case found it to be as stated—either wood cellulose or rags. Proceeding from the nitrating department, we came to the washing department, where the nitrated material is washed, and again I made a careful inspection of the contents of the washing tanks and confirmed the use of wood cellulose or rags. Passing from this department, we entered the building where grinding was in progress, and I ascertained beyond all doubt the nature of the materials so treated. The wood cellulose or rags was then re washed, which concluded the process of preparation (and proved conclusively that no difference existed, whether the gun cotton was prepared from linters, rags, or wood cellulose). During the process of this investigation special attention was directed to the easy absorbing capacity of the wood cellulose, and it was stated that wood cellulose contained when nitrated an especially high amount of nitrate (more than 13 per cent). On account of the cleanness of the wood cellulose the finished powder is especially described "beständig"—that is, immune against decomposition. In the nature of cost, wood cellulose was declared to be one-third less than the price of linters. Before proceeding to the commercial effect of the restriction in the movement of cotton upon the future I would call attention to an illustration of effect of ignition upon nitrated materials, namely, rags and wood cellulose.

Quantities of both of these materials, after nitrating, were taken from the buildings and placed upon the ground at some distance and there ignited by alcohol, no real difference being discernible between the action of the explosive force of the rags and wood cellulose. The nature of flame, response, character of smoke thrown off, and duration of action seemed identical. Later I was shown a similar demonstration in the smokeless powder derived from both materials, and again could find no difference. I merely state this as an instance of observation, for I am not in a position to give any technical information of value in the matter of witnessing such explosions. The illustration came about through the repeated statements that the forces of the allies could determine the difference in the character of ammunition used. This is said to be beyond the range of human possibility by explosive experts with whom I have discussed the matter, and is borne out by these demonstrations.

During the inspection of the Spandau Works, the following interesting facts were gleaned from Maj. Gorke and other officers, namely, that: Prior to August, 1914, all gunpowder and explosives were produced from saltpeter nitrogen, manufactured from saltpeter imported from Chile; that cotton linters prior to that date were exclusively used, and were mostly imported from the United States; that until seven years ago camphor, an essential part in the manufacture of explosives, was imported from Japan. The high price of camphor then induced German chemical manufacturers to produce synthetic camphor, which was manufactured to a great extent by the use of turpentine oil. The turpentine oil was an American product and large quantities, running into the millions of dollars in value, were imported for this purpose. The stoppage of this exportation from America by Great Britain compelled the German chemists to seek for a new substitute, and synthetic camphor is produced

to-day from another material, which is considerably cheaper than turpentine and more effective than Japanese camphor. It is therefore shown that the German ammunition manufacturers have successfully solved all important questions, and that within the German domain is contained all necessary materials. At this time Germany is supplying, to a large extent, the ammunition demands of Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, and has several months' reserves on hand for the necessities of most stringent warfare.

The losers by Great Britain's action are therefore:

First, Chile, two-thirds of whose saltpeter production, prior to the outbreak of war, found its way to Germany, for with the establishment of an industry for the production of nitrogen from the air, at a cost of 100,000,000 marks, this product will hereafter be supplied by Germany, and a saving has already been effected, for the price of Chilean saltpeter compared with German saltpeter is 9 as against 7 marks. This not only enables Germany to meet her own demands after the conclusion of war, but to become a competitor with Chile in the markets of the world.

Second, America, from whose cotton fields almost all the linters used in the manufacture of gunpowder and explosives were supplied. Now, in times of war and peace this demand is entirely removed, for the solution of the cellulose problem enables Germany to effect a considerable saving in cost and will lead, upon the conclusion of peace, to the elimination of linters from the manufacture of explosives.

Third, America, from whom supplies of turpentine oil were obtained at a cost of many millions of marks through the enforced substitution of a commodity created by necessity and claimed to be the superior of this American natural product.

In the matter of cotton holdings, it can be definitely stated that there is an ample sufficiency in hand to meet all military demands for the next three years, such as uniforms, hospital supplies, and other purposes. The same is said to be the case with wool, and one thing is certain, namely, that large purchases of wool and cotton in Turkey were made by the newly formed *Deutsch-Orientalische Handelsgesellschaft*, of which Mr. Alfred Lohman is president.

Returning to the question of the use of wood cellulose as a component part of manufacture of explosives, I would direct attention to the fact that 49 manufacturers' plants are engaged in the manufacture of wood pulp in the German Empire, and as a part of this report I submit a list of the names and locations of these plants.

I would furthermore direct attention to the fact that wood cellulose is used in explosives in the same relative manner as is cotton, namely, as a propellant; that the extent to which cotton has been used in this connection does not justify the statements so frequently circulated since the cotton question became an acute war issue.

Without the use of cellulose or rags there is a sufficiency of linters in German Government hands, but with the solution brought about by the perfection of wood pulp within the past 60 days a large amount of Government-owned linters have been released for industrial demands, and I saw at one place 3,000 bales of linters which were released by the Government to manufacturers because not required for military purposes. Careful inquiries from every source of knowledge at my command, namely, observation in the zones of activity, the statements of military authorities, the reports of the war press representatives, and the first-hand knowledge of civilians who have witnessed the passage of supplies to the various parts of the front, convinced me that there has been no necessity for a change in the manufacture of guns; that the wood cellulose propellant is of equal strength to the cotton propellant; that the rifling of the large arms of the service as well as the small weapons does not demand a change due to the difference of propellents in explosives, the same firing chamber being used to equal advantage.

I directed my investigations in these channels as far as possible not only on this present trip to Germany, but upon the numerous occasions which have presented themselves since the war began and which carried me to many parts of Germany and Belgium and the regions of military activities. One prominent attaché assured me that throughout his entire observation of German military progress, artillery was employed with the greatest freedom, and that at no time was there any scarcity of shells nor evidence of a varied nature of explosives employed. In concluding my report upon this important and far-reaching subject, I desire to note my interest in the matter by stating that I have absolutely no affiliation nor connection with any company or individual, either American, German, or of other nationality, who is engaged in or would profit by the movement of cotton from the United States to Germany. My interest in this matter is wholly political, for I feel that the Southern States have been deprived unfairly of one of their greatest markets; that the British Government has been forced against its will to act in bad faith by making cotton contraband; that certain Liverpool interests, actuated by purely financial reasons, were behind the false statements which developed into a preconceived campaign of misrepresentation as to the use of cotton for explosives; that is the extent to which cotton can be employed. For this reason I secured an opinion from Prof. Will, of the University of Berlin, and I am pleased to submit his letter of December 3, 1915, bearing on this subject. I will add that my real interest in seeing a restoration of commerce, guaranteed by the law of nations between Germany and the United States, comes through my desire to bring about a movement of dyestuffs from Germany to the United States. Having been instrumental in the securing of supplies of these important materials from Germany during the autumn and winter of 1914, I have closely followed the possibilities of providing American industries and labor with such essentials, and I find to-day that we are facing a serious industrial problem, which can only be overcome by a speedy solution of the commercial relations between Germany and the United States.

Very respectfully, yours,

HOWARD W. BIBLE.

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. SMITH of Georgia, The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

After the conclusion of the speech of Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this war has been prolific on the part of all the belligerents of violations of the rules of inter-

national law as we have understood it heretofore. The Senator from Georgia deserves great credit for calling attention to the manner in which the British Government in one way or another has violated the rules of international law in respect to American commerce. Most of our commerce during the war has filtered into or through the little neutral countries of northern Europe—Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Most of the commerce which has been held up by the British orders in council has been commerce and traffic plying to those countries.

Now, while in no manner justified, on the contrary I entirely agree with the conclusions reached by the Senator from Georgia in respect to the conduct of Great Britain, yet in this connection I want to present to the Senate another side of the picture. There are those four little countries that I have referred to in northern Europe. I have a list in my hand here of the number of merchant ships of those countries which have been sunk by German submarine boats and German mines since the war began up to the 14th of this month, and the list is perfectly startling. These are merchant vessels, traders. I will say that I have compiled this list from the leading commercial newspapers of the city of New York that have from day to day published an account.

The total number of vessels sunk by submarines, mines, and by warships—the latter being only one—is 134. One hundred and three have been sunk by German submarines, 30 have been sunk by mines, some of them German and perhaps some of them English, and 1 was sunk by a war vessel.

I have been able in this list to give the names of the vessels and to give the date when they were torpedoed or sunk. It appears from this list of 134 vessels that the total number of Dutch ships sunk is 11, the total number of Danish ships sunk is 15, the total number of Swedish ships sunk is 27, and the total number of Norwegian ships sunk is 51.

As I said the other day, since the German merchant marine has been eliminated from ocean traffic most of the trade traffic is carried on by our own ships, some by the English, and to a large extent by these neutrals.

I am unable to give in this list the tonnage of all the vessels. In some instances the tonnage has been given. Neither am I able to give a list of the people who have been destroyed when the ships were sunk, but it is a horrible record. In many instances many of the poor sailors, the crews on these vessels, have perished by reason of the submarines.

Now, there is this difference, to which I want to call the Senator's attention, between the British method and the German method. The British have held up our ships, taken them into port, searched their cargo and taken out what they conceived to be improper and either confiscated it or commandeered it, but in the main they have let the ships go; they have not destroyed the ships. The Germans have not only destroyed the cargo but they have destroyed the ships, and in many instances they have killed the crews on these vessels.

Of course these four little neutral countries of Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are, in the face of these great powers, helpless. They have to submit to this treatment. I bring this to the attention of the Senate in order that when the great country of the United States intervenes in this matter it will see to it that the traffic of these neutral countries is protected—protected not only in the interest of our commerce, but in the interest of fair play to these neutral nations.

Just think of it, 134 vessels destroyed, mainly by German submarines, since the war commenced.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Can the Senator give us the locality of those vessels, where they were principally?

Mr. NELSON. I can not give the locality. It has been done along the Norwegian and Swedish and Danish coast and the Holland coast in nearly every instance. I will say, in addition to that list, there are a great many Scandinavian vessels that have been taken into German ports, and have been condemned in their prize courts. There have been two or three instances where German warships have seized Swedish vessels within Sweden's territorial waters. One occurred a short time ago. They finally released it.

So, Mr. President, without intending to take up the time of the Senate any further, in view of the able speech of the Senator from Georgia, and in view of the fact that he presented one side of this picture of interfering with neutral rights, I felt it incumbent on me to present the other side of it, that the people of this country may see just what has transpired.

Mr. President, I ask that this list may be incorporated, without reading, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

Data concerning the sinking of neutral vessels belonging to the northern neutral nations, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, and which were sunk by belligerents engaged in the present European war by means of submarines, mines, or warships between the dates Aug. 1, 1914, and Jan. 14, 1916.

Nationality.	Tonnage.	Sunk by—	Name.	Date of sinking.
Norwegian.....	1,507	Submarine....	Pluton.....	Aug. 1, 1914-Feb. 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Gottfried.....	Aug. 27, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Hesvik.....	Sept. 23, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Tromo.....	Oct. 14, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Vaaren.....	Dec. 17, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Boston.....	Dec. 22, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Ell.....	Dec. 25, 1914.
Do.....		do.....	Castor.....	Jan. 10, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Bjerka.....	Feb. 20, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine....	Semantha.....	Feb. 3, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Regin.....	Feb. 23, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine....	Belridge.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Nor.....	Apr. 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Eva.....	Apr. 22, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Caprivi.....	Apr. 24, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine....	Lalla.....	Apr. 30, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	America.....	May 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Baldwin.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Oscar Fr'stad.....	May 3, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Oscar, Arendal.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Martha.....	May 15, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Maricopa.....	May 19, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine....	Minerva.....	May 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Gubona.....	June 2, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Superba.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Glitterind.....	June 7, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Trudvang.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Belleglade.....	June 13, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Devanger.....	June 14, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Granit.....	June 16, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Gerda.....	1915.
Do.....		do.....	Truma.....	June 23, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Thistlebank.....	June 30, 1915.
Do.....	1,925	do.....	Cumbuskenneth.....	Do.
Do.....	1,094	do.....	Gjeso.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Katka.....	Do.
Do.....	914	do.....	Marna.....	Do.
Do.....	1,448	do.....	Fiery Cross.....	July 5, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Peik.....	Do.
Do.....		Submarine....	Lysaker.....	July 8, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Svein Jarl.....	July 9, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Nordaa.....	July 10, 1915.
Do.....	1,073	do.....	Harboe.....	July 15, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Rym.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Nordlyset.....	July 22, 1915.
Do.....	3,819	do.....	Fimreite.....	July 26, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Sogndalen.....	July 27, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	G. F. Harbitz.....	Do.
Do.....	2,730	do.....	Trondhjemsfjord.....	July 30, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Vandis.....	Aug. 5, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Horman.....	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do.....	1,081	do.....	Geiranger.....	Aug. 9, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Morna.....	Aug. 11, 1915.
Do.....	189	do.....	Jason.....	Aug. 10, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Aura.....	Aug. 13, 1915.
Do.....	820	do.....	Amulius.....	Aug. 14, 1915.
Do.....	649	do.....	Mineral.....	Do.
Do.....	1,381	do.....	Bras.....	Aug. 19, 1915.
Do.....	1,063	do.....	Magda.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Sverresborg.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Kong Gutform.....	Aug. 28, 1915.
Do.....	884	do.....	Glimt.....	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do.....	1,639	do.....	Storeaand.....	Sept. 7, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Norte.....	Sept. 13, 1915.
Do.....	563	do.....	Actle.....	Oct. 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Florida.....	Do.
Do.....	1,398	do.....	Salerno.....	Oct. 14, 1915.
Do.....	987	do.....	Selma.....	Oct. 26, 1915.
Do.....	1,091	do.....	Eidsiva.....	Nov. 1, 1915.
Do.....	5,600	do.....	Wacousta.....	Nov. 14, 1915.
Do.....	1,659	Mine.....	San Miguel.....	Nov. 17, 1915.
Do.....	2,379	do.....	Ulriken.....	Nov. 18, 1915.
Do.....	516	Submarine....	Klar.....	Nov. 26, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Hercules.....	Dec. 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Nereus.....	Dec. 10, 1915.
Do.....	782	do.....	Ingstad.....	Do.
Do.....	780	do.....	Nico.....	Dec. 19, 1915.
Do.....	712	do.....	Homelen.....	Dec. 29, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Rigl.....	Dec. 30, 1915.
Do.....	1,912	Mine.....	Fridtjof Nansen.....	Jan. 6, 1916.
Do.....	2,275	Submarine....	Bonheur.....	Jan. 7, 1916.
Do.....	1,158	do.....	St. Paul.....	Aug. 1, '14-Feb., '15.
Do.....	2,534	Mine.....	Allico.....	Do.
Do.....	1,461	do.....	Atle.....	Do.
Do.....	1,183	do.....	Andreas.....	Do.
Do.....	1,412	do.....	Droit.....	Aug. 1, '14-Feb., '15.
Do.....		Submarine....	Heima.....	Mar. 13, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Ellida.....	May 1, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Elisa.....	May 2, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	M. Roosvall.....	May 28, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Bergladen.....	June 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Minosa.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Fram.....	June, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Otis.....	June 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Kipple.....	June 2, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Daisy.....	July 14, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine....	Capella.....	July 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Emma.....	July 28, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Sogndalen.....	July 27, 1915.

Data concerning the sinking of neutral vessels belonging to the northern neutral nations, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, etc.—Continued.

Nationality.	Tonnage.	Sunk by—	Name.	Date of sinking.
Swedish.....	303	Submarine.....	Fortuna.....	July 29, 1915.
Do.....	3,779	do.....	Malmland.....	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do.....	804	do.....	Mai.....	Aug. 9, 1915.
Do.....	1,107	do.....	Disa.....	Aug. 25, 1915.
Do.....	1,601	do.....	Sven Renstrum.....	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do.....	1,013	do.....	Frosvik.....	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do.....	1,229	do.....	Texelstroom.....	Oct. 7, 1915.
Do.....	272	do.....	Wolf.....	Nov. 1, 1915.
Danish.....	1,270	do.....	Nereus.....	Nov. 28, 1915.
Do.....	580	do.....	Skuli Fogeti.....	Aug. 1, 1914-Feb., 1915.
Do.....	2,336	Submarine.....	Hamma.....	Do.
Do.....	927	do.....	Mary.....	Do.
Do.....	2,804	do.....	Cathay.....	May 5, 1915.
Do.....	9,000	do.....	Betty.....	May 26, 1915.
Do.....	4,815	do.....	Soborg.....	May 31, 1915.
Do.....	2,229	do.....	Nogill.....	July 27, 1915.
Do.....	2,609	do.....	Maria.....	July 28, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Neptunis.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Lena.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Hans Emil.....	Aug. 7, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Frode.....	Sept. 5, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Thorvaldsen.....	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Veset.....	Sept. 25, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Minsk.....	Dec. 10, 1915.
Dutch.....	2,336	Mine.....	Houtdijk.....	Aug. 1, 1914-Feb., 1915.
Do.....	927	do.....	Nieuwand.....	Do.
Do.....	2,804	Submarine.....	Maria.....	Do.
Do.....		do.....	Media.....	Mar. 13, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Schelland.....	Apr. 1, 1915.
Do.....		Warship.....	Katwyk.....	Apr. 14, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Emma.....	Sept. 22, 1915.
Do.....		Submarine.....	Emdyke.....	Sept. 25, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Ellewoutsdijk.....	Dec. 7, 1915.
Do.....		Mine.....	Erin.....	Dec. 29, 1915.
Do.....		do.....	Mooshaven.....	Jan. 14, 1916.
Total tonnage of Norwegian ships.....	44,030			
Total tonnage of Swedish ships.....	16,839			
Total tonnage of Dutch ships.....	25,720			
Total tonnage of Danish ships.....	4,650			
Total available tonnage of ships destroyed.....	91,239			
Total number of ships sunk by submarines.....	103			
Total number of ships sunk by mines.....	30			
Total number of ships sunk by warships.....	1			
Total number destroyed.....	134			
Total number of Norwegian ships.....	81			
Total number of Swedish ships.....	27			
Total number of Danish ships.....	15			
Total number of Dutch ships.....	11			
Total number of ships sunk.....	134			

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], with his usual good, hard, sound common sense, has said several things well worthy of remembrance, and especially this one thing, that there never was a war in the world between two or more great powers possessing land or sea strength when the rights of neutrals were strictly respected.

Mr. President, we carried on a war with France for quite a while once, when neither the French Republic nor the American Republic ever declared war, but the forces of the two countries were fighting one another upon the high seas, because the French Republic, under the control of the Convention, had defied every international law known up to that date.

Not long after that Great Britain, joining in with Prussia and with Austria, the continental powers, in making war upon the French Republic, violated nearly every right of neutrality the world had ever recognized by international law.

Mr. President, in all these troubles—this one and the previous trouble—there has been this marked distinction that goes to the heart of every man who has a heart. There was a class of hostilities and troubles that threatened and sacrificed our property. There was a class of hostilities and troubles that threatened and sacrificed our lives. Although I am not a great admirer of the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, and never have been in a political sense, though his relations and mine personally have always been pleasant, he has said one thing that I, at least, think to be true, that any comparison between what the United States owes to her citizenship in connection with the sacrifice of life and what she owes to her citizenship in connection with the sacrifice of property is a comparison between resenting murder and resenting petty larceny. That utterance of Roosevelt is worth sinking into all your minds, and let it sink. It is true.

Mr. President, we had a war over here between the States not very many years ago as history goes, a great many years ago as the ordinary individual life goes, and what did your people do to mine? Was it your Army that whipped us? You know it

was not. If it had not been for the women and children and men whom you starved to death and the soldiers who could no longer wear a uniform and shoot, because they had nothing to eat, I imagine we might have been fighting yet. Your Navy whipped us. Your sea power strangled us. Your sea power starved our civil population first and then starved our army afterwards.

The Confederate soldier was the most quixotic human being in the world, I reckon. He was fed on Sir Walter Scott's novels and upon the ideas of chivalry that he drank from that source and from others. We sometimes made complaint, as Admiral Semmes did, that a Yankee vessel had armor on it while our vessel did not, and that it was "not a gentlemanly way of fighting." We sometimes made complaint as an old friend of mine did, that he was captured by the Yankees because he was mounted on a Yankee mule and the mule went back to the braying of the other artillery mules in the Yankee line, in the battery from which the mule had been captured. Most quixotic claims were made by all of us; but there never was a Confederate from Jeff Davis down to the humblest soldier who ever "pleaded the baby act" because his wife and children and he were starved by your Navy.

You would not even let quinine come in. You would not let quinine come for your own soldiers at Andersonville to be administered by a Federal surgeon when Jeff Davis proposed it to you.

Now, I am not complaining here. My forefathers did not complain. War is war. It is not a system of caressing. [Laughter.] War is carried on subject to certain rules of civilized warfare. We people down there for a little while thought that Sherman was a regular barbarian. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] will remember that. You people thought for a little while that Admiral Semmes was "a sea pirate," at least you said so. Are they not both angels compared with what we have seen lately in Europe? Sherman did not do anything except to burn down houses of noncombatants and issue orders at Atlanta that noncombatants must get out of Atlanta, when the poor, helpless women and children had to "trek" as best they could. But that is absolutely angelic in comparison with what has been done lately in this European war. Who ever dreamed at that time that any civilized power had any right to strew the high seas with mines, not to destroy on purpose, but to destroy accidentally, anything that incidentally struck the mine? Who ever dreamed at that time that any power at war had a right to cast bombs from midair upon noncombatant women and children sleeping peacefully in villages and cities? Who ever thought at that time that any assassin of the sea had a right, without warning, to shoot and sink men and women and children upon an unarmed merchant ship? A lot of you here have been trying to excite yourselves and trying to excite the American people lately about 19 American citizens who were killed upon Mexican soil. Killed by whom? By the Mexican Government? No. Killed by anybody pretending to represent the Mexican Government? No. Killed by bandits, killed by robbers, robbed of their clothes and of their money when they were killed so as to prove that their murderers were robbers, and yet a lot of you seem to want to shed Mexican blood and have Mexicans shed your blood because of it—oh, I beg your pardon, not your blood, but the blood of some of your fellow American citizens. None of you want to have your blood shed, not a blessed one of you. A lot of you seem to want to shed the blood of Mexicans and to have Mexicans shed your national blood, we will call it—if there is any such thing—because 19 American citizens were killed by robbers and bandits upon Mexican soil—upon Mexican soil; remember that.

There was a man by the name of Jesse James who was more or less remotely connected with the Confederate military service. Later on, his way of carrying on war not being in accordance with the Confederate Government's idea of carrying on war, his connection with the Confederate Government became rather remote, but he carried on war in his way. Suppose that in February, 1865, Jesse James had happened to kill two or three British subjects while he was killing other people, and had happened to take their watches and their money away from them while he was taking the watches and money away from other people, and suppose that the British Government had written Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward at that time a note to the effect that they would be personally liable, and that the United States Government would be held liable, unless they caught Jesse James and punished him within some period, definite or indefinite, what would you have thought? You were powerless, even with all your power, to catch or to punish him.

You put a paper blockade upon the South; nobody ever pretended that your blockade was effective all the way down the

line. The whole Atlantic coast and the whole Mexican coast was within the scope of your paper blockade, and whenever anybody violated that blockade, even if the violators got loose and escaped out upon the high seas, you captured their ships and confiscated their cargoes, and you had a right to do it. Whether you did or not the world submitted to it. My forefathers never plead the baby act about it. You whipped us in fair fight as war goes—war never is altogether fair—but you did it. Now, even-handed justice recommends the poisoned chalice to your own lips, including the doctrine of continuous voyage, which this Government either originated or very much emphasized and stretched.

Now, let me talk about cotton a little, for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has been talking about cotton. Cotton is worth twelve and thirty-eight one-hundredths cents a pound—middling spot cotton, not futures—in the Memphis market, which happens to be my market, and it has been worth that for two or three weeks. Prior to that time it was worth twelve and twelve and a half one hundredths cents per pound in the Memphis market for two or three months.

If peace came to-morrow, cotton would not be worth over 10 cents a pound. Why? The increased demand for explosives and tents and tarpaulins and uniforms and the increased rapidity in the destruction or wearing out of each. Whatever else this war has done, it has not lowered the price of cotton. True it is that for the first four or six months of the war the war did lower the price, because it dislocated the entire financial system, the entire exchange system, and the entire trade system. It demoralized everything in connection with imports and exports, but especially in connection with bank business, financial operations, and foreign exchange. We suffered enormously upon the first year's cotton crop after the war broke out, and I suffered my share. It has made me run pretty close to the shore for quite a long while. But at present what is becoming of the cotton crop? It is selling at from 1 to 2 cents per pound higher price than, with the same supply and demand, it would if all the world were at peace and there were no war uses for it. Why, Mr. President, Great Britain and France and Italy in normal times take 73 per cent plus of our entire cotton-export business, and that 73 per cent is going to them now. More than the usual amount is going abroad, outside of Germany, Austria, and Italy, for the neutral countries are not only getting their share, but Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland have been getting a little bit more, which has been pretendedly imported for themselves, but really shipped through them to Germany and her allies. So the 73 per cent amounts to-day to about 83 per cent. That is uninterfered with. Now, I want to talk plainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator from Mississippi will allow me to ask him a question, I will ask, does the Senator refer to our general exports or to our cotton exports?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I refer to cotton exports, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Mississippi did not exactly understand me. I understand him now to be referring to our exports, and he did not say whether the countries he mentioned took 73 per cent of our cotton exports or whether they took 73 per cent of all our exports. I suppose he meant our cotton exports, and that was the reason I asked him the question, as I wanted to be sure that I correctly understood him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Georgia is right in his supposition, and I supposed that every Senator who understood the situation knew what I meant. Of course, our exports of cotton to Great Britain, France, and Italy could not constitute 73 per cent of our total exports of goods and merchandise, and if I failed properly to express myself—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that he is mistaken about that. If he will refer to the statistics of the department, he will find that those countries do not take 73 per cent; he will find that Germany, Austria, Norway, Holland, and Denmark take but one-third of our entire export of cotton, that Japan and other countries take about 10 per cent of it, and that the countries he names take not quite 60 per cent of it—about 55 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I stand upon my assertion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course the Senator can stand upon it, but he is merely mistaken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Notwithstanding the Senator's denial, I say that, although I have not the papers by me and have not the statistics by me, Great Britain and her colonies and dependents—of course I meant to include them in the British trade—France and her dependencies, and Italy and her dependencies take about 73 per cent of our total cotton exports. Even if I were wrong about that, Holland and Norway and Sweden and Denmark have been getting during this entire war,

except during the first four or five months of financial dislocation, which affected everybody, much more than their full normal share of our cotton.

Now, I want to say another thing—that if the Senator from Georgia could have his way, and if this Congress were to pass and the President were to sign the measures which he is advocating, it would necessarily result in nonintercourse with the allies, unless the allies were going to stand still like a lot of whipped curs, while they were engaged in a war which they believe to be for life and liberty and for national independence, and obey the ukase of a United States Congress, with 90,000 men in the Army behind its ukase and only the fourth navy in the world behind it. It is absurd to suppose that they would be cowardly enough to stand bullying from a people who can not bully because they have nothing behind them to bully with, who can not bluff because they hold no hand. Men from the time they are children are bullies. A schoolboy never bullies a fellow that he knows is bigger and stronger and whom he believes braver than he is. He generally bullies somebody he thinks is weaker than he is or else who is, in his opinion, more cowardly than he is—one of the two. You stand here and say to Great Britain, to the allies, and to the balance of the world that you propose to put an embargo on the shipment of ammunition and munitions of war, contrary to our traditional theory, unless they change their paper blockade—if you choose to call it a paper blockade, but which seems to be wonderfully effective, because it stops every ship, which is more than your northern blockade did during the War between the States—you stand here and say that to them and then expect them to lie down in a fight which they believe to be a fight for the liberty and independence of the world against a newer Roman Empire, revamped and revarnished—expect them to keep quiet and purr without even growling. Will they? Of course not.

Then what will follow? Commercial nonintercourse. Then what becomes of cotton? Cut off the British market and cut off the French and the Italian market and their colonies and their dependencies, and cotton would not be worth 4 cents a pound week after next. You will not even have helped, but would have murdered the price of cotton, even after you had been base enough to make that the chief consideration of your policy.

I hate to argue a great international question from the standpoint of a special interest, even though it be my interest. I do not think it is worthy of the occasion. I do not think that the fact that I might or might not be temporarily disfinanced by this war—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will in a moment—is a sufficient reason for undertaking to let the Germans or English or French or Russians or Italians or anybody else kill American boys summoned to the colors, unprepared and undrilled and untrained, to be murdered. I do not believe it is a sufficient reason for me to justify myself for killing other country's boys even if ours were trained and drilled and ready.

Mr. President, I hope to live to see the day sometime when internationalism will become popular and when the narrow feeling, which is highly creditable as patriotism, will at least not be the leading thought of the world. I hope some day to see "a parliament of man; a federation of the world." I have not lost my hope nor have I lost my trust because of this European war. I have learned, to my sorrow and regret, that the world is less civilized by 100 years than I was foolish enough to think, but I believe still that somehow God reigns and that we are His instruments.

I thought the time had passed when noncombatants could be arraigned and put under peace bonds to keep everybody from shooting against an invading foe, and when they could not keep somebody—a foolish somebody maybe—from indulging in it they would be lined up by a belligerent as Belgian men and boys have been and shot like cattle. I did not believe that that was a possibility. It is not the first instance in my life when I have been a fool. That time I was one.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the Senator in one second.

Mr. President, the interruption of the Senator from Nebraska has for a moment taken me off the track, but I will try to conclude that thought as briefly as I can. I have come to the conclusion that the forces making for peace and liberty and honor and contract keeping and righteousness in this world have got somehow to whip the forces that are fighting for the other and opposite things; and I would hurl foul scorn at myself as my father's son if I ever came to the conclusion that I had

no right to fight for liberty and righteousness and national independence and the life of my women and children against world dominion and somebody's "place in the sun," if it became necessary to fight. I am no professional combatant, either. I have for long years submitted to hearing myself denounced as "a peace fanatic," and in a certain sense I am, for "my passion is peace," as Thomas Jefferson said, not only nationally but in every other way. I would not lift my foot against an ant upon the sidewalk if I could help it. But it is about time we were recognizing facts; and, above all things, I do not want to see Dixie, I do not want to see Georgia, Mississippi, and old Virginia, and the volunteer State of Tennessee and her sisters, Louisiana and Arkansas and the Carolinas, and all the other Southern States, put in the attitude of seeming, at any rate, to care just as much about property as they do about life; of seeming, at any rate, to care more about their particular property, which is the cotton crop, than they do about the women and children that went down unknelt and unshriven to their graves in the sea, not upon German soil, as the 19 Americans were upon Mexican soil, but upon the high seas, the property of no Government and of no power, and upon unarmed merchant vessels—"unknelt, unknelt, unknelt," and unknelt. Until that question is settled I do not propose to join in any movement to nag the President of the United States and to nag this present Democratic administration—and, by the way, for a Republican administration I would say the same thing; at least I think I would, although I am not sure [laughter], because nobody is perfectly certain of himself when he is as dyed-in-the-wool partisan as I am; but I believe I would—I shall not join in any movement to nag them into something that must result in—I hardly know what it would result in, but it must result in something very bad, something worse than we can at the present time predict, at any rate.

Mr. President, I think I know my people, and when I say that, I do not mean the people of the whole United States, because I am a provincialist, an ultra southerner, and I am not in the very highest and most catholic sense even a citizen of the United States; but I do, I think, know my people, and I know that the men who followed Jackson and Lee and whose wives and children starved and who themselves starved in what they thought a holy cause—the men who followed Stonewall Jackson in his last campaign up the valley, when they had nothing to eat but parched corn and were rationed like the horses—except that the horses ate the corn raw and they ate it parched—are not ready yet to put cotton and human life upon the same level, and especially when they have sense enough to know that it would not even help cotton if they did, and that the only hope for cotton is keeping open the English, French, Italian, and neutral markets of the world. Now, I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has said that he would not assert the neutral rights of the United States with the Army and Navy because they are inadequate. He has said, in effect, that he would not assert through the powers of Congress commercial pressure to compel a country to recognize our neutral rights. Now, I ask him what he would do when a country defies the protests we make against the outrages of our rights as a neutral? What would he do if he would not take either of these other courses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if ever I said either one of those two things which the Senator from Nebraska has attributed to me, I must have said them in a dream or while I was asleep. I have forgotten them, if I ever did say them. What would I do? That question is pertinent, and I shall answer it. I should do what the United States Government did during the French revolutionary war and during the Napoleonic wars and during all the other periods of our history when we were faced with this unfortunate situation of maddened, angered, blood-intoxicated belligerents, not respecting neutral rights. I would lodge my protest, and I would uphold the principles of international law and the rights of neutrals until a proper day of reckoning came under our treaties and under general international law, rather than fight about money, if the sole cause of the quarrel were either money or base merchandise; I would wait until the people to whom I had appealed, or to whose Government I had appealed, had become sober and cool, and then I would accomplish about what the United States Government did in the case of the Geneva award. Abraham Lincoln and Seward and the men other than Seward who were advising Abraham Lincoln did not push that matter just at that time, but when the proper time came they did push it. All quarrels about money can be cured with money, and all delay in curing them with money is measured by universal agreement by a rate of interest. I would not kill one human being on the surface of this globe, American or foreign, because of mere property or because of mere dollars until I had been able at least to appeal

to a cool and self-possessed court, not maddened by war passion, not intoxicated with blood, and had then found that a foreign power had deliberately, coldly, and purposely refused to do me justice, even after an award. Then, if that took place, I would fight with what heart and strength and might and main that God had given me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had one other question that I wanted to present to the Senator. Of course, there is some precedent for some such method, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] suggests, such as the acts passed during the administrations of Washington and of Jefferson, the patron saint of the Senator from Mississippi, but I do not care to refer to them, although I should like to hear the Senator express his opinion of them. I want to say to the Senator, however, that there may be another issue besides money—a direct sovereign right of the United States may be invaded, as we know it has been invaded. Does the Senator know anything about the violation of the mails of the United States upon the high seas? Does he know that 63 bags of mail sent upon a Holland boat from New York to Rotterdam were seized upon the high seas, taken into the Downs, and those 63 bags of United States mail, addressed to a neutral country, were taken upon English soil—

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means, addressed to citizens of a neutral country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I mean to say that the universal postal convention, enacted and reenacted for many years, in which every civilized country of the world takes part, guarantees the immunity of the mails, and contains the solemn promise that every party to it will permit the mails to cross its dominions free and immune. Finding that Great Britain insisted on censoring our mails which touch at British ports, our Post Office Department began the plan of shipping neutral mails direct to a neutral port, and then Great Britain seized those mails upon the high seas—first-class mail and registered letters, and sent by neutral citizens of one country to neutral citizens of another country—took them into a British port, and have not yet consented to render any justice. Now, I ask the Senator, suppose that right, that sovereign right, of the United States to send its mails to a neutral country is not acknowledged by Great Britain, what would the Senator do under those circumstances if he would not fight and would not pass legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What the Senator wants me to say, I suppose, is that I would agree to declare war upon Great Britain and have a whole lot of Irishmen, Englishmen, Welshmen, and Scotchmen and a whole lot of Americans and Canadians and Australians killed because my mail had been interfered with. Well, I decline to do it. [Laughter in the galleries.] That is all there is about that. I do not know how important the Senator's mail is, but mine is not important enough for that; and I do not think the mail of the average citizen of the United States is, unless it is some spy within the United States bearing the title of an American citizen while he really bears allegiance to some foreign government, and, so far as he is concerned, I do not care whether his mail is interfered with or not. I pass over any reference to the single great mistake of my patron saint's—Mr. Jefferson's—life, his embargo and nonintercourse acts, which hurt us more than our enemies, and maddened New England to the verge of secession.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator know what the instructions of the English Government are to its censors who examine American mail?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nobody else does, precisely. I know what I have seen in American newspapers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken. I have the confidential—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care about the details.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, let me tell the Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I do not care about them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I should like, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not care what they are; I am not going to shed one drop of American or Canadian blood on account of any confounded [laughter in the galleries]—I beg pardon—on account of any foolish action of the British censors with regard to letters and parcel-post matter. So it is absolutely immaterial as to what they have said; I do not care about the itemized account. What they have done is wrong, and I refuse, notwithstanding it is wrong, to cut their throats about it. That is sufficient.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator does not care if the business mails of the United States are opened, and the bills of lading are examined, and the weights and prices are taken, and they are

all taken to a central authority in Great Britain, where they can be transferred to the British manufacturers and the British shipping agents, so that they may know the secrets of the United States business men and may steal away their trade in the midst of war? The Senator does not care for that? If they do that act under the great war power of censoring the mails for the purpose of promoting their own commerce, does not the Senator care?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Mississippi "cares" in a certain sense. Of course the Senator resents every act of a belligerent which violates neutral rights. I am not talking about not caring. If I said I did not care, my mouth overshot my intellect. But what I do mean is that I do not care enough to shed human blood about it. Now, as to whether the British censors take these private business letters and hand them over to British business concerns, do you know, I do not believe a word of that. I think Great Britain is a little bit too busy in war on land and on sea just at present, fighting to maintain her naval supremacy and her empire, to be engaged very much as a government right now in discovering or betraying "trade secrets." But, whether she is or not, it is one of the sad things that always accompanies a nearly universal war between peoples when each side thinks it is fighting for its existence and when they are not paying as much attention as they ought to to the bystander. It is just as if the Senator from Wyoming and I became inflamed, and both were armed and prepared, and began to shoot at one another on the street; if a bystander happened to run in between our shots it would be very bad for the bystander, and if my bullet happened to go plumb through his body or his bullet through mine and hit somebody else on the other side it would be bad for that person.

Now, you must recognize facts. When you get people engaged in deadly warfare, fighting, as they think, for their very lives, for their very liberty and national integrity, for their very civilization and culture, respectively, they are thinking chiefly about themselves; secondly, about the enemy; and thirdly, about neutrals. "You all" paid mighty little attention to neutrals during the war when you were whipping us, when you strangled us, and when you starved us—and you only whipped us by starving us. Your sea power is the way you whipped us, and you had a right to do it, after once war was declared, provided your right to declare it was recognized. We had gone into it. We went into it with our eyes open. We knew what we were meeting. You struck a country that never had made food enough to feed its own population during any year of its existence, and does not do it even now. You had a plain open-and-shut game before you. If you could just keep up the embargo long enough we would die by self-strangulation, by starvation; and we did.

No; I am not saying that I do not care about these violations of neutral rights. I am merely saying what I said a moment ago—that I do not care enough about them to shed blood about them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I went further than that, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Here are 3,000 miles of boundary between us and Canada up here. We never have had a fort along that line. They are as much Americans as we are, although they call themselves Canadians, and we assume to ourselves the name of an entire continent. Do I want my boy to go out and kill Canadian boys, and Canadian boys to come in and kill my boy—and if we go to war some of my boys will be in it—because somebody stopped Mr. Threefoot's mail on its way to Schweisenskopt or somewhere else in Sweden, Copenhagen, Norway, or somewhere else?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] does not propose to go to war.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no. He proposes to do what will force us into commercial nonintercourse, with the hazard of war half considered.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And the Senator is not in favor of that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is he in favor of? Again I ask him, What is he in favor of doing for the purpose of compelling the observance of our neutral rights?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have told the Senator twice.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He is in favor of letting them go on—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And prosecuting a damage suit in some future years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, well!

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What is he in favor of doing for the purpose of stopping them now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska as an individual did me some money wrong, as an indi-

vidual he would not think it was cowardice or poltroonery upon my part if I said that I would leave it to the determination of some cool, nonimpassioned third party to act as a judge. Now, why should it be cowardice or poltroonery between nations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, then, suppose the thing went on, the offense continued, indefinitely?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, suppose that the moon were made of green cheese. [Laughter in the galleries.] We have not arrived at that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will please preserve order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are there now, right in the midst of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; we are not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It has been going on for months.

Mr. WILLIAMS. God's honest truth is that—no; I will not say that, because there are some truths that you ought not to tell upon the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have already said what I thought we ought to do. What I think we ought to do is that where a damage sounds in money we ought to claim money in damages, and where there is nothing at stake except money that we ought not to shed blood in order to constitute for ourselves a remedy. In other words, I illustrated it by the Geneva award. I could have illustrated it by a hundred other cases where a neutral country, when two belligerents were excited and blood intoxicated, waited for money-indemnity cure until a time came suited to it. I would not surrender one neutral right in the world. I would declare and redeclare every one of them. I would protest against every violation; but I would not shed blood about base merchandise if I could help it.

That it is my answer, and, if it is not sufficient, it is all the answer I can make. The only thing I would shed blood about is blood. When a man came to taking the blood of my wife and my children, then I would want his. The distinction seems to me to be pretty plain. It is plain to men who were raised as I was raised. I never heard, in the time of the duello in the South, about gentlemen ever challenging one another about money. I never heard that the worst duelist fanatic in the world ever wanted to kill another man about a bill or about a property damage, and I am not going to do it now.

Mr. President, 19 American citizens are killed on Mexican soil, and a whole lot of you want to nag and nag and nag your President into a course of conduct that will result in war with the Mexican people. You want to go down and kill a lot of Mexican peons and a lot of Yaquis and a lot of other Mexicans because a Jesse James bandit somewhere robbed and killed a certain number of your citizens. And yet not a blessed one of you is introducing a resolution about the several hundred Americans killed, not on German soil but upon the high seas; not by irresponsible bandits but by the prepared and declared policy of a Government. And why? Why are you pursuing such different courses? Simply because you think Mexico is little enough to be kicked, and Germany is too big to be kicked. That is all.

I am not blaming you about the course pursued with regard to Germany. I make many allowances for those people. I do not hate Germans and Germany. I love German literature; I love German history; I love German lakes and rivers and mountains and seas; I love German culture, and I love especially the people of the Rhine country and about Wurtemberg and Schwaben and Bavaria. I know they are my equals and yours. I am not quarreling with you because you are not nagging the President about Germany. I am not quarreling with you about that; but I am quarreling with you because you are nagging him about Mexico when no Mexican governmental offense has been committed, and when you dare not nag him about Germany. You are wise when you do not. You had better get ready, so that you can support your "nagging," before you get to nagging anybody who can fight back. What is more, you know it, and by divergent courses of conduct and elocution you are daily and hourly confessing it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] brought to the attention of the Senate a list of vessels that had been sunk by German torpedo boats, submarines, mines, or some other kind of device, and he stated that he desired both sides of the case presented to the Senate.

We may all congratulate ourselves that the side of the United States, so far as Germany is concerned, has been presented and that every indication justifies the hope that the position of the United States upon the subject of safety at sea has been recognized, and that great good has resulted from the course pursued by our Government. I wish, however, to call attention to the fact that in February the President of the United States submitted both to Germany and to Great Britain a request that each should agree in future to cease acts violative of estab-

lished rules of international law—Germany to abandon her submarine attacks, Great Britain to abandon her disregard of international law in the suppression of shipments of foodstuffs going to Germany. Germany's answer practically accepted the suggestion of the United States, and Great Britain's practically repudiated it.

I am no apologist for what has been done by Germany. I am proud of the fact that our Government has contributed to bring to a stop conduct upon the ocean that endangered human life. But, Mr. President, to call attention to the fact that Great Britain has not only disregarded our rights upon the ocean, but continues to do so, and refuses absolutely to recognize the sovereign rights of this country, should not in any sense be considered a condonation of what Germany has done.

Our German troubles are practically over; and the beneficial results of the communications that have passed between the two countries I trust will live in time to come.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I do not interrupt the Senator for the purpose of disturbing him or annoying him in his argument.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will not disturb me at all.

Mr. NELSON. I simply want to call his attention to the fact that so far as our negotiations with the German Government related to submarines, there was only an understanding as to what they call "liners," the great steamships that carry passengers on regular routes. The agreement or understanding, or whatever you may call it, that was made between our Government and the German Government, related only to that kind of ships, and not to the freighters—not to other ships than merely the liners that carry passengers on regular routes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I think it extends to stopping before sinking freighters also. I so understand it.

What is the attitude of Great Britain? Each violation by Great Britain is followed by another violation of our international rights. Because Germany has been guilty of murder, are we for that reason to concede the right of perpetual robbery to Great Britain? Are we, each time we ask for recognition by the Senate and by the House of our rights upon the ocean, disregarded by Great Britain, to be turned off from their consideration by something that I trust is a thing of the past, and has been practically disposed of by diplomatic negotiations? I trust not.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], differing so much as he does at different times both in the accuracy of his intellect and in his style of expression, this afternoon presented himself in an inaccurate frame of mind. He declared that the first assertion of the right of seizure of ships or cargoes upon the theory of continuous voyage was set up by the United States during the Civil War. Why, the Senator does not manifest his usual familiarity with history. He surely should know the earlier cases in which this doctrine was set up in Great Britain, and the difference between the two lines of thought. He says that during the Civil War the United States Government blockaded the coasts of all the Southern States and of Mexico. Again he shows his utter inaccuracy, his lack of knowledge upon which to predicate a statement. The order of blockade issued by President Lincoln was limited to the Rio Grande, and if the Senator were at all familiar with the cases upon this subject he would know that in the *Peterhof* case the Supreme Court called attention to the fact that the order of blockade stopped at the Rio Grande, and that it did not apply to Matamoras, across the Rio Grande, and that innocent commerce could pass into the Confederate States through Matamoras free from any interference by the United States.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator if he can tell how long prior to the Civil War England had abandoned the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The continuous-voyage rule, as laid down by Great Britain before the Civil War and as laid down by the National Government during the Civil War, has no connection whatever with the issue to-day between the United States and Great Britain. The continuous-voyage doctrine as laid down by Great Britain was with reference to her colonies, and limited to them, and it does not touch our issue at all.

Mr. STERLING. And even the doctrine of continuous voyage, as it related to the colonies of Great Britain, had been abandoned long prior to the Civil War; had it not?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think so. It had been questioned, at least, and I think there had been no continued enforcement of it.

The doctrine asserted by the United States in the *Bermuda* case was on a construction of facts; the court found that the vessel left England with the purpose, really, of going to Charleston and running the blockade, and for this reason it was subject to seizure at any time, though it nominally had a destination of Nassau, while its real destination was a southern port closed by blockade. That was the doctrine of the *Bermuda* case, and that was the doctrine applied to the goods in the *Springbok* case.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia, so that this matter can be gotten straight, whether there has been any controversy whatever between our Government and Great Britain in this matter touching the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think not.

Mr. WALSH. Do not both of them admit the doctrine as applied to the present situation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think each agree that the doctrine of a continuous voyage does not justify a belligerent in seizing neutral goods going to a neutral port, and from there to the enemy, if the goods are innocent.

Mr. WALSH. The United States concedes that they may justly apply the doctrine of continuous voyage?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. To contraband.

Mr. WALSH. To contraband.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Why, certainly; and Great Britain has never asserted the right under rules of international law to apply it to innocent goods, or to apply it to conditional contraband where she could not show that the conditional contraband was intended for the army or navy of the enemy. She has not proceeded under the rules of international law. She has set up a bald order in council, setting aside international law.

But the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has assumed to speak for "my people." He is very eloquent when he talks about "my people," though not always very accurate. It always amuses me when he discusses a business question. He is entitled to preeminence for his incapacity to handle business questions, either in discussion or in reference to statistics. He tells us he is the cotton planter from Mississippi! I desire to assure the people of the country that they are not limited to his production for their supplies. [Laughter.]

But the Senator from Mississippi turned on me with a ferocious look—I almost trembled—and asserted that "my people would resist the idea of putting money above life." Then he talked about the "code duello." Well, he has lived ages ago. I do not know anything about that. Thank God, it had passed out before I came along. I deny his right to suggest, directly or indirectly, that those of us who criticize the course of Great Britain in suppressing our legal trade have placed commerce above life. It is an unfounded suggestion. It is an inexcusable one. It is the refuge of the advocate to divert attention from the real charge.

There is not a people anywhere more loyal to personal rights than the people of the section that I have the privilege in part to represent; but I do not place them in that respect ahead of our neighbors farther north or west. My own belief is that the people of our entire country, let them come from where they will, place life above property. But I have yet to find, even in my section, those who for that reason are willing to have all their property rights and the sovereign rights of this Nation disregarded. There may be some few who, like the Senator from Mississippi, soar in such lofty flights at times that they place property so low that they object to any word ever being spoken in defense of it; but I deny that that sentiment represents the people of the section from which I come. I am sure that they would not embarrass the President.

The Senator says that we are seeking to nag the President. The statement is absurd. It is from lack of information that the Senator so expresses himself. Unfortunately, he did not have the advantage of hearing the entire presentation of the subject which I made. He only came in at the last, and lacks information; and now he has left, and still insists upon not being informed.

Mr. President and Senators, I would not nag the President. I have the highest regard for him. I expect to support him this

fall for reelection, and I hope the good judgment of the people of the country will keep him where he is. I do not differ with the President about this matter. I am following the letters of the State Department, and asking Congress to do its part. I do not mean that under no circumstances would I differ with the President. If I thought a President was doing anything calculated to involve this country in war which was unnecessary, I would deem it the part of patriotism to protest his action. I do not admit that a President must be followed if his conduct would bring the country to war, when those who have the right to declare war disagree with him. Fortunately, however, no such condition confronts us. The President has resisted, under great pressure, those who would have involved us in war.

The President placed the loss of life first in his diplomatic notes; but he did not fail, as the negotiations moved along, to present a most earnest protest against the illegality of the course of Great Britain. In opening my remarks I took occasion to call attention to the splendid letter of March 30 and to show that that letter protests squarely not only what Great Britain is doing now, but the right of Great Britain, if a complete blockade should be made, to stop our trade to neutral ports.

Mr. President, that splendid country, Sweden, those brave people, are standing out for their commercial rights. I want to reach a hand across the ocean and say: "We stand by you," not in a spirit of war but in a spirit of courage and manhood; not in a spirit of bullying. I have uttered no words that sounded like bullying. The face of the Senator from Mississippi, as he turned upon me, had every appearance that I was to be bullied and silenced; but for some reason I was not frightened, even by his assumption of knowledge and superiority. What I ask is that we let it be known that we understand our rights, not to bully Great Britain, but to call on Great Britain to return to law, to return to the law which she has made, and give her great statesman the support that action on our part would furnish to stand out against lawless acts. I long to see those principles of international law that Great Britain and the United States together have given to the world fully followed by both nations; that they may mitigate the evils of war and help to strengthen the rights of those at peace.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to prolong this discussion longer than a very brief moment, but I want to submit a few observations. That England's interference with business intercourse between the neutral nations on the high seas is in violation of international law which she herself was a party to writing and which she herself had admitted to be the law from time immemorial there is no question. The people of the State whom I have the honor to represent in this Chamber have suffered grievously from that violation. It has cost the cotton growers of the South on the crop of 1915, in my judgment, not less than one quarter of a billion dollars. It has enabled the manufacturers of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russia and the manufacturers in the United States to obtain cotton for their mills at 75 per cent of its true value, and the losses resulting from this unfortunate situation have fallen heavily upon the men, women, and children who toiled for 12 long weary months to produce the cotton. Something has been said about going to war—taking human life to promote commercial interests. Mr. President, I do not want to go to war; I would not go to war for the purpose of promoting commercial interests. I would not have the United States Government sacrifice one soldier for all the money on earth. But I maintain it is incumbent upon the United States Government to protect the business interests of its citizens. I hold it is just as much the duty of the American Government to protect her citizens against robbery, against plunder; in other words, protect them in the enjoyment of their liberty and property as it is to protect them in the enjoyment of life. Unless they shall be thus protected, life would not be worth living. If the business rights of the citizens are not protected, if international law shall be violated and our citizens robbed and plundered without interference or protest on the part of our own Government, it is but a short step from such a violation of the law to that of murder. No; we do not want war, and every means possible consistent with honor should be exhausted and every expedient available should be employed to avoid war, with all of its horrible consequences. Nobody is asking the United States to go to war with Great Britain at this time in order to protect the business interests of the people of America and force her to observe the law. But the reverse is true. We are only asking the United States Government to employ peaceful means within its power by which the Government of Great Britain may be induced to respect the business rights of the American people.

Now, to say that we will permit England to continue the methods of the highwayman, which she has persisted in for nearly a year without protest, lest she may retaliate by cutting off all business intercourse, is asking the American people to be guilty of something which to my mind approaches pusillanimity. If the Congress shall pass an act putting an embargo upon the shipments of munitions to the allies, to remain in force until the allies shall cease to interfere with trade between the neutral nations, it would be doing no more than we have a right inherently to do. We have a right to employ retaliatory or any other measures for the protection of the American people, and if war should come from the exercise of our inherent, legitimate rights the responsibility for war will not be upon the American people. I hope, Mr. President, that we have not become a nation of cravens. We will not sell our manhood for 4 cents a pound on cotton; we will not yield to the tyrant's demand, even though it should involve us in war; and I want to say further just in this connection that the American Government is amply able both on the sea and land to defend the rights of her people. We have the greatest Navy to-day the world has ever known, with the exception of Great Britain's and as large an army as may be necessary to defend the American flag and keep that sacred emblem in the air, and we are ready to-day to do service in that noble undertaking. I am very weary, if I may be permitted to use that cant expression, Mr. President, of listening to all this talk both in the Halls of Congress and in the public press about the inadequacy of our Navy and insufficiency of our Army. The contention made by the Senator from Georgia is sustained by all writers of international law. He is in this matter only following the lead of the President of the United States and of the great Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, in his interpretation of the law. He has insisted upon what every other patriotic representative of the American people should insist upon, that even the exigencies of war can not be urged as an excuse for a gross and palpable violation of international law, especially a violation of the law which is followed by such disastrous consequences as that which flows from the conduct of the allies in interfering with the legitimate commerce of a neutral country. All we ask is justice—that the rights of our citizens shall be respected and the honor of the Nation upheld. For my country—

I am not covetous for gold,
Nor care I who doth feed upon my cost;
It yearns me not if men my garments wear;
Such outward things dwell not in my desires;
But if it be a sin to covet honor,
I am the most offending soul alive.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be until Monday next. I make this motion because there is a great deal of committee work to do, and I have been requested by Members on both sides to be given an opportunity to complete certain committee work.

The motion was agreed to.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. The amendment to the amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be inserted by the Senator from Arkansas insert:

Within two years after the passage of this act the President shall invite the cooperation of the principal nations interested in the affairs of that part of the world in which the Philippines are located, for the purpose and to the end that the cooperating nations shall mutually pledge themselves, in the form of a treaty or other binding agreement, to recognize and respect the sovereignty and independence of the said Philippines, and also to mutually obligate themselves, equally and not one primarily nor to any greater extent than another, to maintain as against external force the sovereignty of said Philippines for the period of not less than five years from the taking effect of such treaty or agreement.

Within one year after the taking effect of such treaty or agreement the President is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippines.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I submit the following amendment to Senate bill 381, the Philippine government bill, which I should like to have printed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. After the word "appoint," on line 10, page 21, insert "all executive secretaries, directors and assistant directors, chiefs and assistant chiefs, superintendents and assistant superintendents of departments, bureaus, and divisions, the attorney general and assistant attorney general, collectors and deputy collectors of customs, and," and after the word "such," on line 11, insert the word "other," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 22. That the supreme executive power shall be vested in an executive officer, whose official title shall be "The Governor General of the Philippine Islands." He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, and hold his office at the pleasure of the President and until his successor is chosen and qualified. The Governor General shall reside in the Philippine Islands during his official incumbency and maintain his office at the seat of government. He shall, unless otherwise herein provided, appoint all executive secretaries, directors and assistant directors, chiefs and assistant chiefs, superintendents and assistant superintendents of departments, bureaus, and divisions, the attorney general and assistant attorney general, collectors and deputy collectors of customs, and, by and with the consent of the Philippine Senate, such other officers as may now be appointed by the Governor General, or such as he is authorized by this act to appoint, or whom he may hereafter be authorized by law to appoint; but appointments made while the senate is not in session shall be effective either until disapproval or until the next adjournment of the senate, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there will be no session to-morrow, and there is no likelihood of disposing of the bill this afternoon, I desire to submit to the Senator in charge of the bill if it would not be proper to terminate the proceeding upon it at least formally. It is perfectly evident that the measure can not be disposed of to-day, and by running over until Monday it is likely that it can be disposed of on that day or certainly the day following.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is thoroughly satisfactory to me either to lay the bill aside temporarily or to adjourn. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is temporarily laid aside.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico:

H. R. 65. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to certain gas, electric light and power, telephone, railroad, and street railway companies and franchises in the Territory of Hawaii, and amending the laws relating thereto;

H. R. 3042. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii relating to the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory, as herein amended, and amending the laws relating thereto; and

H. R. 6241. An act to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii; and extending the control of the public-utilities commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder.

H. R. 153. An act to create a bureau of labor safety in the Department of Labor was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 407. An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1916.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Clyde A. Rosseter to be register of the land office at Valentine, Nebr.

James Y. Callahan to be register of the land office at Guthrie, Okla.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Horace Palmer Cravens, Magazine.
W. L. Jarman, Helena.

KANSAS.

I. J. Hart, Pleasanton.

MICHIGAN.

John W. Barley, Dexter.
Clio S. Case, Brighton.

MINNESOTA.

Jessie J. W. Hogue, Tyler.
John Kasper, Faribault.

NEBRASKA.

Francis A. Thompson, Clay Center.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John F. Mann, Wilcox.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 20, 1916.

POSTMASTER.

Z. M. McCarroll to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 20, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William A. Leopold, D. D., of Bethany Evangelical Church, Norristown, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of nations and of people, we come to Thee with grateful hearts this morning, and thank Thee for health of body, strength of purpose. Guide us this day, we pray Thee, in all the ways of truth and righteousness. We can not trust ourselves, we can not trust the elements of the universe, but we can trust Thee, O Thou Supernal Guide. Guide us in all the affairs of life, and let Thy blessing rest upon the President of the United States and his Cabinet. Bless the Members of the Congress. Guide us all in the ways of righteousness and wisdom and true holiness. Help us to do right and fear no one but God, and serve Thee—the true and living God. Thy blessing be upon us as we go through the journey of life, and at last receive us into Thine own blessed kingdom, through Him who taught us to say, when we pray, Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us, and lead us by Thy council in all the ways of righteousness, and in the end receive us as Thine. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LAZARO, be granted leave of absence for 10 days on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LAZARO, be granted 10 days' leave of absence on account of important business. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ITALIANS.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague Mr. SIEGEL, who is absent at a committee hearing, may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing therein two letters, one to himself and his answer thereto, in relation to alleged discrimination against citizens of Italian birth at the Military Academy at West Point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] asks unanimous consent that his colleague Mr. SIEGEL, who is unavoidably absent, may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing two letters in relation to alleged discrimination against Italians at West Point. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and prior years, and for other purposes. Pending that motion I